

A
DISCOURSE
Concerning the
ONE ALTAR
And the
ONE PRIESTHOOD
Insisted on by the
ANCIENTS
In their Disputes against
SCHISM.

WHEREIN

The Ground and Solidity of that Way of Reasoning is Explained, as also its Applicableness to the Case of our Modern SCHISMATICKS, with particular Regard to some Late Treatises of Mr. RICHARD BAXTER.

BEING

A Just Account concerning the true Nature and Principles of SCHISM according to the Ancients.

By H. DODWELL, M.A. and sometime Fellow of Trinity College near Dublin.

Εἰ τις παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἰδίᾳ ἐκκλησιάζῃ, καὶ κατασκευάζῃ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἰδίᾳ καὶ ἀπορίᾳ, μὴ συνόντῃ τῇ πρεσβυτέρῳ καὶ γνόμενῳ ὁπισκοπῇ, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Conc. Gangren. Can. 6. Cod. Can. Eccl. Affric. Can. 11.

If any one keep private Ecclesiastical Assemblies in opposition to the Church, and shall dare, in contempt of the Church to perform Ecclesiastical Offices, without the presence of a Presbyter allowed by the Bishop, let him be Anathema.

LONDON, Printed for Benj. Tooke, at the Ship in S. Paul's Church-Yard. 1683.



A

PREFACE.

TO truly generous Spirits no *Sect. I.*
Interests are dearer than The Discovery of
those of the Publick, and Truth how
to truly Conscientious there obliging.
are yet no Publick Interests
more dear than those of Truth, especially
such Truth as has relation to Religion.
This being that wherein the good of man-
kind is most eminently concerned, whoever
serves it obliges every particular Person,
who ought accordingly to acknowledge the
Obligation, if he would approve himself
grateful and ingenuous. But tho all
Mankind receive it, yet no sort of Persons
have more reason to be sensible of an Ob-
ligation of this nature, than they who un-
dertake the Enquiry of Truth as a parti-
cular Employment. These, as they ought
in reason to be presumed most convinced of
the value of such Truths; so they are, more
A 2 *than*

The Preface.

than others, served in all Discoveries of this kind, whoever he be that is their Benefactor. Others are served in the promotion of their greatest most concerning Interests, but these are also served in the Gratification of their particular Desires.

Sect. 2. O N this Account all Proposers of Expedients for New Discoveries of necessary and useful Truths, ought to look on themselves as highly obliged by useful Objections. Thus Aristotle owns an Obligation to those who have gone before us in such Enquiries tho without the desired success. And Socrates, as he was the Son of a Midwife, so he professed himself to imitate his Mother's Art in examining the Inventions of his Predecessors, whether they were true and solid Births, or only like the Effects of Wind and Tympany. When the Objection is prudent, and fitted to the Hypothesis which is to be tryed by it, tho it be a Mistake, if it be a Popular one, and likely to come into the minds of others, it is notwithstanding very useful (for facilitating the reception of such a Truth with such persons) to prevent it, and to speak particularly to it. For all lawful Arts are to be used for recommending Truth as well to the Capacities and Affections of all who are concerned in it,
as

The Obligingness of useful Objections.

Metaph. L. II.

The Preface.

as to the Understandings of the ablest and most competent Judges. If it prove to be an unforeseen Phenomenon, whatever the Event be, the Information will still be very useful. If it be solvable by the Hypothesis, it will be a great Confirmation of the Truth of it, that it fits other unknown Phenomena as well as those for which it was purposely calculated, especially where the agreeableness with Phenomena is the principal Argument for proving an Hypothesis true, as it is in many Cases wherein Mankind is very confident. If it disprove it in one single Instance, it will then give warning so to limit the general Proposition as that the disproved Instance be not included, and withal so to limit the Proof, when a proof a priori is insisted on, as that nothing be allowed in the proof, which, if it should be allowed, would favor the Instance so disproved, which must mightily improve the Evidence above what it had appeared formerly. If it should utterly disprove it, yet even so it could not be ungrateful to any who preferred Truth before his own Party, or his own Inventions. It would take him off from fallacious confidences, and put him upon nobler and more beneficial Enquiries.

The Preface.

Sect. 3. BUT then this Obligation only holds when the Objections are truly useful. When they are otherwise, they are neither beneficial to Mankind in general, nor to either of the litigant Parties in particular. Not to Mankind in general when it is not Truth, but Victory, which is the thing contended for. If there had been any thing more solid in the Glory of a Victory, yet it were only the Interest of a private person, or a private party, that had been promoted by it. Truth alone is that which can pretend to be the common Interest of Mankind, as well of the Conquered as of the Conqueror, and the very Divisions and Animosities, and Rancors, which naturally follow on such Defences, are certainly great and publick mischiefs where there are not Truths, and Truths momentous enough to make amends for them. Nor is the Success any way beneficial to the Conqueror himself. As Truth it self is not discovered by such Objections, so they are very hurtful where they are not serviceable for such Discoveries. They are puffed up with the thoughts of it, they are hardened in their Sin against any remorse when they make others think that they can justify them by Principles, they are diverted from
more

The Preface.

more profitable Enquiries, and still kept off at a distance from all hopes of Peace and Reconciliation. Much less can it be thought beneficial to the Conquered, when, besides the unhappiness of being overcome, he has no Interest to be promoted, no desire to be gratified, by it; nay, besides the calamity of his Mistake, he is withal liable to all the dangerous Consequences of the Mistake it self.

TO resolve therefore whether I be obliged to Mr. Baxter for his Objections, I shall not take upon me to be Judge in my own Case. The prudent Reader is and ought to be Judge between us, whether his Objections be indeed useful and beneficial. Yet there are withal some Rules of judging so very plain and obvious as that I think it cannot look like any prejudging or imposing on him to mention them. The very mention is Evidence enough with equal Judges, and I do not intend to give the Reader, or my self, much more trouble than that of mentioning them. Such is that of starting New Questions. I will not undertake the many particulars wherein Mr. Baxter has offended in this kind. Such is that, of his calling for a particular account of all Persons succeeding each other in their

Sect. 4.

The usefulness of those of Mr. Baxter's

His starting New Questions.

The Preface.

Ecclesiastical Offices from the Apostles times to ours, when I had prevented it by proving that a presumptive Succession was sufficient, where no particular failing can be proved, as I have shewn it may be proved in the Case of most of the Ordinations of his Nonconforming Brethren. This he very well knew, and frequently mentions, nor does he ever once, that I can find, offer to disprove what I have produced for it. Yet, as if he had again forgotten it, he is ever and anon calling for Catalogues through all the Periods of Succession. I will not charge him with Insincerity in doing so, but methinks it is very strange Forgetfulness.

Sect. 5.

His impertinent Question concerning an universal Church Sovereignty.

IT were endless to recount all particulars of this kind, it is so usual with him in speaking to any one Question to start many new ones, and upon all occasions rather to multiply Heads than to speak accurately to any particulars. But one Instance there is which I cannot well omit, because he seems so pleased with it, that he designs it for an Argument of a particular Volume, wherein I must also be more particularly concerned, and insists on it as a proof of his slanderous Accusations of me. This is that he would have me prove, That the Universal Church hath a Visible

The Preface.

ble Supreme Government besides Christ. *When I do this he promises he will no more trouble me with lesser Controversies. He means no doubt a Government over the Universal Church collectively. For neither he, nor any one else who maintains a Visible Government over particular Churches besides Christ, can deny but that such a Government, by extending to all particular Churches must include that which is Universal; and, by having no Visible Government above it, must consequently be the Supreme of all Governments that are Visible.*

BUT what relation has this Question Sect. 6. to my Charge of SCHISM against the Nonconformists? Of what Use can his Objections be, either for disproving my Charge, or much less for answering my Arguments? Had I grounded my Charge of SCHISM from the Catholick Church on any such Notion of a Form of Government of the Catholick Church collectively, he might have had some pretence of diverting to that Question. But I was all along expressly cautious of distinguishing the question of SCHISM between Churches and Churches, as disputed with the Romanists, from the Question concerning particular Churches and their revolting Members, which

Of no use in our present Dispute.

The Preface.

which was that I undertook against our Nonconformists. Accordingly I managed the whole Charge against them, that they were guilty of SCHISM, for separating from their particular Churches, and their particular Bishops, whilst living in his Jurisdiction. This I proved through the Book. And yet that they might not undervalue the Charge as if they were SCHISMATICKS only to a particular Church, yet so as still to retain their Unity to the Universal Church, according to the fancy of the Latitudinarians; I therefore came at last to prove that SCHISM from their particular Churches must, in the Consequence, divide them also from the Universal Church. Plainly I never grounded my Charge of SCHISM on any one Form of Government common to the whole Catholick Church, nor on any one Individual Judicatory, but on a Form so common to all, as it is multiplyed according to the multiplicity of particulars, yet multiplyed so as that all particular Churches are obliged by God, and their own common Interest, to ratifie each others Censures, and to preserve a common Correspondence. So little ground Mr. Baxter had, from my Principles, for that invidious Question

The Preface.

stion concerning an Universal Sovereignty.

IN vain therefore does he charge me Sect. 7.
with Opinions concerning this Universal His Charge perfectly
Church Supremacy, when I deny the groundless.
Foundation of all such Opinions, the
thing it self. As my Principles did not
oblige me, so neither did I ever give him
any the least occasion for those slanders
which he is pleased to charge me with.
Where did he ever hear me say that the
Government of the Catholick Church col- Answer to
lectively ought to be either Monarchi- my Letter
cal or Aristocratical, either in the from
Pope or in a General Council? Sbrensbury.
Where
did I say that the Pope ought to be
Principium Unitatis? I am so far from
saying it that I have lately disproved the
contrary pretence of de Marca in that very Dissertat.
particular. Where did I say that the Cyprianic.
Pope ought to have any Primacy or Pre-
sidentship in general Councils, or that
it belongs to him to call such Councils,
and to him alone; so that they are but
unlawful Routs or Rebellions, if they
assemble without his Call? Or that
they are SCHISMATICKS, who dis-
sent and disobey this Supremacy?
How will he prove that, because I do in-
deed assert this Power to the Bishop, in
reference

The Preface.

reference to the Assemblies of his own Presbytery, within his own Diocess, therefore I must grant the like Power to the Pope in the Assemblies of the Bishops? Yet this is all the occasion I can think of that might lead him into such Mistakes. Where did I say that the French Church are no Papists, whilst they own the Popish Communion? tho I believe many of them are so, rather by Faction, than by Principles, who deny the Fundamental Principles of Popery as a distinct Communion. But I cannot think it any way Just that others, who agree with them only in those Principles so destructive of Popery, should, for that reason, be accounted Papists, whilst they do not agree with them in their Communion. Where did I say,

Ans. to Dr. Sherib. p. 198, 199.

Ans. to Let. from Shrewsb. Confid. of Pres. con.

that our Communion was with any part of the Roman Church, either Jesuited, or others? Where, that the Councils of Constance or Basil were no Papists? He knows I have proved the Council of Constance (and the French Church too) guilty of the Hildebrandine Doctrine of Deposing Princes, &c. Where did I once call Thomas Aquinas Saint, as he says I am used to do? He knows that I have also charged him with the Deposing Doctrine. Where did I mention a word of the

Ans. p. 13. Confid. ib.

the

The Preface.

the Terms either of Cassander or Grotius, as if I thought them sufficient for a lasting Peace? He may charge me with what he pleases, if he may be allowed this Liberty of inventing Assertions for me. So far have I been from saying any of these things with which he charges me, that himself does not pretend (as I am sure he could not) the least Authority for so mischievous Accusations. He pretends no word in any Discourse, no Expression in any of my Books, no certain Information from any who could pretend to any Reason of Knowledge. And let the Reader judge whether this became the Sanctity and Conscience to which he so much pretends.

YET I deny not but that the whole Sect. 8.
Church is governed by the Episcopal The Government of
College. This is an expression for which the Catho-
he takes all occasions of traducing my Lord lick Church
of Ely. But that Holy and Learned Pre- by the E-
late knew very well the Language of that piscopal
Primitive Christianity which flourished College ex-
long before the Rise of Popery, tho
Mr. Baxter, it seems is not acquainted
with it. It is the constant Phrase of S.
Cyprian in his Epistles, and of those who
were concerned in them. And by it they
mean no more than the multitude of par-
ticular

The Preface.

Diff. cypr-
anic.

particular Ordinaries who were called Collegæ in the language of those Ancient Laws, as being of a Rank and Order by themselves. This I have lately proved in a Latin Discourse on those Epistles. But thence to infer an Universal Church-Supremacy would be as vain as if one should infer an Universal Secular Supremacy, because all Nations are governed by a multitude of Secular Governors. Only I confess that herein is a disparity, That all Ecclesiastical Governors are more obliged to maintain a mutual correspondence, and to ratifie each others Censures than Secular Governors are. And it was from this very Principle that I inferred, That whoever was lawfully deprived of the Communion of any one Bishop or Church, must thereupon lose his Right to the Communion of the whole Episcopal College, and consequently of the Catholick Church as including all particulars. And what has Mr. Baxter to say to this way of Reasoning? If he have any thing, let him once, at least, be perswaded to undertake the Arguments by which I proved it.

Sect. 9. BUT it is Mr. Baxter's usual way to judge of the Language of Antiquity by Modern Notions and Circumstances of Affairs in England. And perhaps our Academical

The Preface.

demical Colleges, or Collegiate Churches make him fancy that, when we speak of an Episcopal College, we must mean some such Bodies of the Bishops cohabiting together, and ready to assemble as often as there is occasion. Accordingly he asks, Where is that College that governs you? Which way had you their Mandates? Were they gathered from all Nations in the Christian World? Who compared their Votes? What were the cases put to them, &c. And having fancied this to be our Doctrine, it was indeed easie to make it look like an Universal Aristocratical Supremacy.

Ans. to Dr.
Sherl. p.
219.

But sure he could not think that S. Cy- Sect. 10.
prius, or any of his Contemporaries could allude to any of our Modern Colleges. Collegia in his time, and according to the use of the Roman Laws, did not, in the least, imply Cohabitation. The Consuls were called Collegæ, where-ever they inhabited, whether in the City, or in what part soever of the Roman Empire. The Guilds and Fraternities, as we now call them, were then called Collegia, who, even by our Modern Customs, are not obliged to cohabit, much less according to the Customs then received in the Roman Empire. So little occasion he had for even mistaking

The Preface.

mistaking S. Cyprian. But possibly he did not bethink himself how much S. Cyprian was concerned in this matter. Could he therefore unwillingly mistake Us? His very Expostulations now mentioned plainly imply, that he knew we could not so much as pretend to any such Body, as now extant in any part of the World. And how could he think that we could own a Government from a Body which we did not believe any where existent? With what ingenuity can his Brethren charge us with owning a foreign Jurisdiction, when what is no where cannot be foreign?

Sect. II.

His Fictions not only against our Principles; but also against our Interest.

SO far are these Fictions from being our Doctrine, as that they are indeed against our Interest to hold them. Had we done so we must then have been accountable to another Adversary in defence of our own Churches against the Innovations of the Church or Court of Rome. And for my own part, he and his Brethren might perceive by my Preface, that I was particularly wary of giving no advantage to the Church of Rome in my charge of SCHISM against the Nonconformists, and that I had therefore purposely set forth my little Discourse of the Fundamental Principles of Popery, that the Papists themselves might see that I would
Speak

The Preface.

Speak nothing unagreeable thereunto in dealing with our own SCHISMATICKS. But had I owned the Pope as a Principle of Unity, I must have owned what I there proved to be the Fundamental Principle of Popery, and consulted as such. And then how could I have defended our own Churches from SCHISM, as being divided from the Principle of Unity? If men will take up things so contrary to our Principles and our Interest, and yet without so very destitute of any thing that might give a well-meaning person an occasion of mistaking us, the Accuser of the Brethren will never let them want Arguments for invidious, tho' groundless, Accusations. He is pleased to call us Designers. We are, no doubt, much beholden to his Candor, that he did not call us Plotters, tho' many of his Readers will think he meant no less. But can he tell any of the Designers that have done more for reconciling us to Popery than his Brother Le Blanc, and the Author of the Catholick Theology?

Ans. p. 62.

ALIKE *unuseful* are his Personal Sect. 12. Objections. The Answer to them were very easie, but very unuseful for publick Writings. They are perfectly impertinent to the strength of an Argument, or the merit

His Personal Objections useless.

The Preface.

merit of a Cause. *What matter is it what Communion I my self am of if my Arguments prove them* SCHISMATICKS *for dividing from the Church of England? Nor are such Discourses like to be grateful to the Readers who are not concerned as we are. They will not be pleased to find Histories of our Lives where they expected just Informations concerning the true nature of SCHISM. Besides, the natural tendency of such Arguments is exasperation and bitterness, the very Plague of Controversial Discourses, and which usually makes them so mischievous and unsuccessful. The Accused will think his Reputation concerned when he is needlessly accused without any exigency of the Cause. And the Accuser will again think his concerned in justifying his Accusations. And by this time both Parties are too much interested to yield to Truth, if it prove unfavorable to their Party, and Readers also are too much prejudiced against ungrateful Truths when their manner of Proposal is withal so ungrateful and disobliging. I am sensible what disadvantage it will be with popular Readers, not to take notice of such things as would make but an ungrateful entertainment to such as were judicious,*

The Preface.

dicious, and I am withal sensible how much more numerous this kind of Readers are. But I am willing to venture the ill opinion of such Fudges, rather than allow my self the liberty of any thing that may look like gratifying resentment. I cannot think it a good account of my time, and I know very well how such employment does gradually degenerate from a defence of Truth to Animosity and Rancor; and whatever Mr. Baxter may do, (who yet seems naturally to be of a temper warmer than mine) for my part I am not willing to venture my self under the Temptation. He seems to have quite forgotten his own submission of these Personal Disputes to the Dean of Canterbury, himself can best tell how consistently with the duty of a good Conscience.

ALL E *un*useful are his Objections concerning the Consequences of my Doctrine so very dreadful to his Brethren. Where they do really follow, he and they are more concerned than I am, and it will the more oblige them to take care that they be very sure those Principles are not true, which, if they should prove so, would make their condition so very sad and deplorable. And his mentioning them with Declamatory Arts of raising odium against my Person,

Sect. 13.
His Objections concerning the Consequences of my Doctrine *un*useful.

The Preface.

son, and Prejudice against my Writings, is so far from being a kindness to the persons whom he pretends to gratifie thereby, that it is indeed the greatest mischief he can do them if he do not first secure them from my Principles. Never let him upbraid me with rigor, or boast of his own Latitudinarian Charity. Our Affections will never change the nature of things, nor recal any Divine Establishments. As no rigor of mine can make any severe Principles truer, so neither will any pretended Charity of his make them falser than they were before. It may make them the more senseless of their danger, but never the securer from it. Where his Consequences do not follow, it is no matter whether they be true or false. If he would deduce any Consequences from my Principles, which he could justifie to be Just Consequences from my Principles, and yet prove them false with an Evidence and certainty exceeding those by which the Principles themselves were proved true, such Consequences as those would indeed be good Arguments against my Principles, and I should think my self obliged to account for them. But it is not his way to be accurate in proving any thing. He is rather for multiplying Assertions and Arguments

The Preface.

Arguments *than for improving any one Argument to any purpose.*

NO less unuseful are his imaginary Sect. 14.
statings of our Controversies.. This is a His false
usual Art with him of making every Case statings of
worse than really it is, and then raising our Con-
his Readers Passions as if it were indeed troverfies
as bad as he has represented it. If any of unfiful.
us dispute against the obligation of the Anfw. to
Covenant, This must be taken for a Dr. Still.
Pleading for Lying and Perjury, and he Serm.
tells us that he hopes one day to see these
Wickednesses taken by us for Cardinal
Virtues. Who would not think by this
that we of the Church of England did in-
deed defend Lying and Perjury? If we
dispute for Ministers Obedience to their
Ordinaries, in an indifferency, he will
aggravate the indifferent Case with such
Circumstances as are neither true, nor,
if they were so, would leave the Action
any longer indifferent, and then argue as
if this were our actual Case. If Noncon-
formists, who have taken Episcopal Or-
ders, and promised Canonical Obedience,
be obliged to obey Bishops, forbidding
their Preaching in Conventicles, then
Bishops may forbid all Preaching, and
all Hearing, and all Christian Assem-
blies, and all publick Worship of Christ;

The Preface.

for there is nothing so wicked but he will suppose Bishops may be guilty of it; how much soever it be against their Interest. And because it is not lawful to forbear all Christian Assemblies for any Commands of Bishops whatsoever; therefore he concludes it unlawful (if he will conclude any thing pertinent to our purpose) to forbear Conventicles for them. First as if a Child should argue that because it is not obliged to forbear all meat at the Parents command, or the Physicians, therefore it ought to obey neither, if they should, like Jonadab, impose any Abstinence in Diet in particular Circumstances. If we again think Magistrates who will be true to their Consciences, obliged in Conscience, to lay out their Talents for the Interest of that Church which themselves believe not only true, but the only safe way to Salvation, and for the suppression of SCHISM and Heresie which themselves believe destructive to their Subjects Souls; this is calling upon them to persecute, tho' discoursed only in private; this is calling for the Haltar and Fire and Fagot, tho, I doubt not, he knows very well, that these are no Legal Punishments of himself, and such as he, and that we of the Church of England as much dislike Capital Punishments

The Preface.

ments for differences only in Opinion as himself can desire. Yet after all it seems he finds it much easier to give ill words, and to make the Assertion and the Assertors odious to persons interessed in the Consequence of it, than to answer the Argument produced for it. He has not so much as offered at any Expedient to reconcile the Magistrates Duty with such connivance, as he would certainly have endeavoured if he had indeed preferred Truth before the Interest of his party.

AS little useful are his Objections Sect. 15.
 that if they should prove true will over- His Ob-
 throw Criteria allowed by the consent of jections
 disinteressed Mankind, allowed by his own which o-
 party, nay by himself in Cases wherein he verthrow
 is disinteressed. There is nothing so cer- the Criteria
 tain in this Life but what all wise men agreed on
 know is liable to many Objections, nothing anastical.
 so unlikely but what withal is capable of
 some likelyhoods more than vulgar capa-
 cities are able to resolve. This gave oc-
 casion for the Academicks and Scepticks
 to deny all Certainty, and to the Sophists
 to profess an Art of Discoursing probably
 on any whatsoever Paradox. Must we
 therefore never proceed to practise, or not
 practise with any confidence, till we have
 first resolved all the Subtilties which may be

The Preface.

objected against it? Must none ever move who is not able to account for all the Arguments against the Possibility of Motion? Diogenes was of another mind, who did not think such Objections worth the Answering. If therefore he and his Brethren be agreed with us that God both intended Peace and a Visible Government in the Church in this Life, and that he has instituted means for the preserving them, and that the means so instituted by God are sufficient for the Ends for which he has designed them; then it will plainly follow, that no such Objections are to be heeded, as overthrow either the possibility of a Visible Peace, or the practicableness of a Visible Government.

Sect. 16.

His Answers hitherto as insignificant as his Objections.

*TO these and the like Topicks of Un-
useful Objections it were easie to reduce
the greatest part of Mr. Baxter's late
Discourses on this present Argument of
SCHISM. Nor is he more happy in his
Answers than in his Objections. I do
not see anything of mine so much as solid-
ly attempted by him. Indeed his Genius
is more for Objecting than answering,
which as it is a very useful Talent when
managed by a prudent conscientious per-
son; so nothing can be more pernicious to
Churches Peace, if he who has it be na-
turally*

The Preface.

turally passionate. Such a one shall never want appearances for embroiling Christians in irreconcilable SCHISMS and endless Controversies. But as for Answering I cannot, for my own part, think of any thing which even himself can mistake for a just Answer. He can hardly think his Remarks upon my Summary to be so, when he has not undertaken the Proofs referred to of any one single Proposition in my Book. He has taken no notice of that former part of my Preface to my Letters wherein I shewed that his past performances could in no sense deserve the name of a Confutation. He has not meddled with that part wherein I gave my Grounds why I thought himself convicted. Much less has he attempted any thing in Answer to my last Letter, either in his last Answer, or in his Treatise of Episcopacy. He is pedantically ambitious of the last word. And, for my part, he may easily obtain it if he cannot be prevailed on to answer to more purpose than he has done hitherto.

Pref. to
Answ. to
Dr. Stillin.
Serm.

HOWEVER to let him see how desirous I am to make my acknowledgments for any thing I can find in him that is really useful, I have undertaken this Argument of the ONE PRIESTHOOD
and

Sect. 17.
The usefulness of this present Subject.

The Preface.

and ONE ALTAR, as that which is indeed the most considerable, and the most frequently inculcated, in his late *Writings*. And I heartily thank him for it. Perhaps he will not be so thankful to me when he finds his *Objection* retorted into an *Argument* against himself, That the ONE Priest can be no other than the Bishop, and the ONE ALTAR no other than that of the Episcopal Communion; when he finds what unexpected Light, the Examination of this one Argument has given us for discovering the whole nature and mischievousness of SCHISM; when he finds of what Consequence it is like to prove for answering a great part of what he has produced for his Parochial Episcopacy.

Sett. 18. *LET* the Unusefulness of his Objections is not the only discouragement for dealing with this person, tho it be indeed a great one. His Unwillingness to own Convictions, where they are indisputably manifest, is that which gives us no hopes of doing good with him, where the publick is not also gratified by some useful Information. I instance in a very plain notorious Example, his prevaricating concerning Aidan and Finan. He had told us more than once that they were only Presbyters,

Mr. Baxter's unwillingness to own Convictions.

Terms of Concord.

The Preface.

Presbyters, and that Venerable Bede had called them so. This I disproved by many and very express Testimonies of that same Author, who calls them both Bishops, and acknowledges that they had a Cathedral, and a Diocese, the whole Kingdom of Northumberland, as large as any of our modern ones. This I shewed before it was Printed, to a Friend of his who then seemed fully satisfied of his mistake. He, I doubt not, acquainted Mr. Baxter with it, and I believe, gave occasion to his Postscript to his Answer to the excellent Dean of S. Paul's. It is not possible for him to clear himself, but either by denying that he said that Venerable Bede had called them Presbyters, or by producing the places where he did so. But in his Answers he neither does, nor attempts, either of them; yet cannot find in his heart to acknowledge his Mistake in so plain a matter of Fact. How then can we believe his frequent Protestations of his readiness to receive Conviction? Answ. p. 2. 90, 155.

• NOR is he alone in this Disingenuity. Another Brother of his, of much greater diligence and skill in these things than Mr. B. has likewise betrayed the same averfeness to fair acknowledgments of indefensible Mistakes. I mean the Author Sect. 19. The Disingenuity of another Author of the Party.

thor

The Preface.

thor of the No Evidence for Diocesan Churches, &c. who shall for me be nameless, seeing he desires it. Mr. Baxter had referred me to him for an Answer, which occasioned my Letter from Shrewsbury to shew how little I was concerned in him. On this occasion I warned him of a small, but very plain mistake, his translating $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\iota$ Thousands, as a tryal of his candor if he should think fit to engage with me farther; which notwithstanding had not been made publick, if his Friend Mr. Baxter had not published it without my leave. In his Postscript to his Defence of his former Book (I cry him mercy for having called it a Pamphlet, tho I meant no hurt in it) he is pleased to charge me with three Mistakes. 1. That I said " that he traslnated $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\iota$ by the definite number of Thousands. 2. That " I said he did it more than once. 3. " That I said he did it sometimes where " his Argument was grounded on it. "

Sect. 20. LET the Reader judge between us, where the Mistake is, whether on his part, or mine, He tells us the number of the Antiochians out of S. Chrysostom, that they were $\epsilon\kappa\omicron\omicron\iota \mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\alpha\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, which he translates 20000. He may indeed say that the word $\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\iota$ is often put for an an inde-

The Preface.

finite number. But where can he find it so when the number of Myriads is so distinctly expressed as it is here? Again he *ibid.* makes the $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\iota$ in Eusebius equivalent to the Thousands in S. Cyprian, and accordingly translates it Thousands. Why did he not keep to the number of Myriads in the English rather than alter it into another number if his design had been only to express an indefinite number? *ibid.* Yet once more, on occasion of Theodoret, who had said that many Myriads did meet in one place to hear, He tells us that two or three Myriads are more than can well hear any one preach. Certainly he again meant Thousands when he speaks of hearing well and conveniently, for one Myriad is much more than can hear in any of our modern Auditories. It is no way probable that he could mean two or three Myriads indefinitely. If he did not, then I have gained my first two Points, both that he mistook Myriads for Thousands, and that he mistook it so more than once. Possibly our English Translation might have given him the occasion of this Mistake, which renders the word as he does. *Jud. v. 14.* BUT was he not, at least mistaken, where his Argument was grounded on his *Señ. 21.* Mistake, and where his Interest required that

The Preface.

that he should not have been mistaken? This he would fain persuade us: But whether truly will easily be known by the occasion of his producing these Passages wherein he is so mistaken. That was to account for the Passage produced out of S. Cyprian by the excellent Dean, wherein he says that thousands of Tickets were granted by the Martyrs in favor of the lapsed, in each of which several persons were also included. To disprove this, and withal to prove what he drives at in that whole Discourse, that their Cities generally were answerable to our modern Parishes, even the greatest of them to the greatest of our Parishes; he undertakes to shew that Carthage could not be so populous as that account of the Tickets would make it, because even Antioch, which was one of the greatest in the Roman Empire, had but twenty Myriads in it. I do not now dispute how true his Observation is concerning the numbers of Antioch, and the mind of S. Chrysostom, tho I think he is mistaken in them. That is a work proper for his Learned Adversary. But it is very plain, by the tenor of this Reasoning, that it was highly his Interest to contract the numbers of the Antiochians, because that was his best way to contract the number
of

The Preface.

of the Carthaginians; and that 20000 was much more for his purpose than 200000, because the former number came nearer to the number of S. Martin's Parish, which is the largest Precedent he can find among us. The later number is so little for his Interest, as that it would most effectually confute him. It would be a third Instance, besides Rome and Alexandria, of a Diocesan City, vastly exceeding our most populous modern Parishes. Thus manifestly he is out in all his three Particulars, tho he has hitherto been so backward to acknowledge it. And indeed his whole attempt to make the Roman Cities answerable to our present Market Towns is so extremely incredible to one so versed in the Histories of those Cities as this Author is, as that it is very hard, on this account also, to excuse him from another Charge of very great Servility to his Cause and Disingenuity in owning his Convictions.

I AM very sorry that I am obliged to take notice of such things in such persons, and shall be heartily glad, if they will, for the future, keep so close to the Cause, as that we may, on neither side, either take or give occasion for such personal Digressions. It will be undoubtedly
our

Sect. 22.

The Preface.

our common Interest to do so. We shall thereby keep our selves more innocent, and be withal more serviceable to the Interest of Truth, and of the publick, to our secular and our eternal peace, if, instead of our other Contentions, we would rather emulate each other in these things, who shall, most of all, divest himself of prejudices and of the favor of his party; who shall express the most sincere zeal for Truth and Conviction whithersoever they may lead him, and withal who can manage the Cause himself thinks good with the least personal offence of Adversaries, I mean such personal offence as is separable from the Cause. How happy might our Nations and our Churches be, if these things were the principal Objects of our disputing Emulations. And how can any well meaning person answer it to God, or his own Conscience, if he will not contribute, in his own proportion, to such a publick and universal Happiness?

*Sect. 23. NEXT to the Observation of these now mentioned Rules, all that I shall further desire from any who shall think fit hereafter to answer what I have written either here or elsewhere, is, that he would be pleased, not to content himself with
general*

The Preface.

general and loose *Objections*, but apply what he shall say distinctly to some particular Proposition of my Summaries, and so apply it as to have regard to the Proofs produced for it. This will better enable the Reader to judge where the Failing is, whether in the Objection, or in the Answer. Certainly much better than the ordinary looser way wherein he must himself be at the pains to find out the Application.

I HAVE only one thing more with which I will, at present trouble the Reader, that is, to observe how the Doctrine here promoted concerning the immediate Presidentship of the Supreme Being, and the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\odot$ as the general Mediator, if it appear agreeable to the ancient Sentiments of the Primitive Christians, must fundamentally overthrow all the pretences for Invocation either of Saints or Angels, both in the Roman and the Eastern Liturgies. If this be so, then there will be no reason to believe these Tutelary Offices allotted to Saints or Angels on which their Invocation is necessarily grounded, I mean such Offices as allowed to them over Christians. If this be so, then there will be no reason so much as to desire their Intercession in presenting our Prayers, because,

Sect. 24.

The usefulness of the Notion of the Immediate Presidency of the Supreme Being in our Disputes against the Romanists.

The Preface.

even there, whatever Power is allowed them, is not permitted to their own Disposal, but determined by particular Divine Appointment, so that they can do neither more nor less than actually they do. If this be so, they cannot avoid the charge of Actual Idolatry who are guilty of that Invocation, how so much soever it were otherwise in the power of created Beings to perform what is desired from them in such Forms of Invocation. It will hence plainly follow, that all things thus prayed for, can be actually granted by none but the Supreme Being alone; it will therefore follow that all Prayers for them before, and all Thanksgivings for them after, they are received, are therefore actually due to him alone: it will therefore follow further that all Prayers, or Praises to Creatures for such Benefits as are usually mentioned in such Forms must be actually the robbing the Supreme Being of that Honor which (on these Principles) is in Justice due to him alone, and giving it to his Creatures, which is that we commonly understand by the notion of Idolatry; it will follow that they must be liable to this Charge, not only in the judgment of our Modern Reformed Churches, (for which they will, no doubt, be less concerned)

The Preface.

concerned) but in that also of those Primitive Churches who proceeded on those Principles from which these Consequences do so necessarily follow, for which themselves pretend a Reverence. And that which is the peculiar advantage of this above other popular Reasonings, is, that this will hold tho they should fail. And for my own part, I do not think it justifiable to charge any Adversaries, no not even the Romanists themselves, with any thing which, even in my own Judgment, I cannot undertake for.

T H E
C O N T E N T S.

Introduction.

How the Ancients reasoned for Unity of Communion from the Unity of the Priesthood, and the Unity of the Altar. Sect. I. Mr. Baxter makes them reason quite contrary to the Design and Interest of their Cause. Sect. II. An account of his way of managing this same Reason. Sect. III. This Reasoning of no force, but as design'd by the Ancients, who used it. Who neither could design the Inferences deduced thence by Master Baxter. Sect. IV. Nor could design the Premises true in such a sense as that the Inferences would follow from them whether they would or no. Sect. V. The Design of the present Discourse. Sect. VI.

p. 1
Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. I.

The Solidity of the way of Reasoning from Jewish Precedents in these very Instances of their Priesthood and Altar.

- I. *This way of Reasoning for Unity from one Altar and one Priesthood was deduced from the nearest and freshest memory of the Apostles. Sect. I. This being granted will be sufficient to shew that the condemnation of SCHISM on these Principles must needs have been agreeable to the Sense of the Apostles themselves. Sect. II. 2. This way of Reasoning is more likely to have been taken up from Jewish Notions than Heathenish. Sect. III. How usual it was for the Christians of that Age to reason from Jewish Precedents. Sect. IV. Used in these very Particulars of their Priesthood and Altar, by S. Clemens Romanus. Sect. V. By S. Paul himself. Sect. VI. Used not only as Arguments ad Homines, but as such as were really conclusive of the Things they were designed to prove. Sect. VII.*

p. 13.

The Contents.

Chap. II.

The Solidity of the same Topick, as to the Principles of this Unity.

3. *This way of Reasoning holds as to this particular Inference, That this one Priesthood and one Altar, ought now, as well as formerly, to be Principles of Unity. 1. The Reasoning from Jewish Precedent to the State of Christianity holds, tho not as to the same things, yet to the same in proportion. Sect. I, II. 2. It holds particularly in matters of Privilege. Sect. III. 3. As Unity is a Privilege common to the Mystical and Literal Judaism, so the proportional Way of Reasoning holds also as to the Principles of that Unity. Sect. IV, V, VI.*

4. *The Unity intended to be proved by the Christians from this One Priesthood and One Altar was that of an External Visible Communion. Sect. VII.*

5. *This Dispute was not between Individual Altars of the same Communion, but between different Altars, as Notes of different Communions. Sect. VIII.*

6. *There-*

The Contents.

6. *Therefore, by the One Priest the Ancients could not mean only Christ, nor by the One Altar only an Invisible Communion with Him.* Sect. IX. p. 27

Chap. III.

How far the Jews were confined to the Use of One Altar. Application to Mr. Baxter.

The Jews expressly confined to One Altar, which Josephus understands as a Preservative of Unity. Sect. I. But 1. This One Altar was only for publick Assemblies of the whole Nation. Sect. II. 2. This did not hinder other places for Religious Assemblies. Sect. III. 3. This did not hinder Altars of Memorial in other places. Sect. IV. 4. This did not altogether make the Use of other Places and Altars Unlawful, even for Sacrifices. Prophets might, and did ordinarily use them. Sect. V. They seem to have been allowed for their Ordinary Sacrifices which did not require Assemblies of their whole Nation. Sect. VI, VII. p. 40

The Contents.

Chap. IV.

Independence of any other Altar on their National Altar was by the Jews condemned as inconsistent with their Unity. Proved from Instances of Altars so condemned.

The only thing which the Jews thought inconsistent with their Unity, as derived from One Altar, was the erecting an Altar owning no dependence on the National Altar, or Rivalling it in its Prerogatives as a National one. Sect. I. Enquiry into the Particulars so condemned. That of the Tribes beyond Jordan. Jos. XXII. Sect. II, III, IV. Those of Jeroboam. Sect. V, VI, VII.*

p. 51

Chap. V.

Concerning the Samaritan Temple and Altar and Priesthood, together with other Temples and Altars.

The Unity of the Priesthood first insisted on by the Jews in their Disputes against the Samaritans. Sect. I. Our Saviour himself

The Contents.

himself declared himself against the Samaritans. Sect. II, III. This Case of the Samaritans happening after the Old-Testament Scriptures, is, for that Reason, more applicable to the Times of the Gospel. Sect. IV. The Samaritans not excluded from the Name and Privileges of true Israelites, on account of the fallhood of their pretences to Israelitish Extraction. Sect. V. The true ground of those false Pretences. Sect. VI. Nor on account of their Idolatry. Sect. VII, VIII. The true State of that Controversie explained from the Words of the Woman of Samaria. Sect. IX. The History of the Occasion of that Difference. Sect. X. XI. The Right of the One Priesthood referred, on both sides, to be decided by Succession. Sect. XII. The Altar of Ahaz. Sect. XIII. The Altar and Temple of Onias in Heliopolis. Sect. XIV. Not SCHISMATICALLY designed by him. Sect. XV, XVI. Nor did it prove SCHISMATICAL in the Event. Sect. XVII. No SCHISMATICAL Succession to the High Priesthood kept up there. Sect. XVIII. How far this instance went to the justifying the Primitive Christians
in

The Contents,

*in reference to the Jews. Sect. XIX,
The other Jewish Temples mentioned
by Onias Idolatrous. Sect. XX, XXI,
XXII. -*

p. 69

Chap. VI.

The Privilege of the Jews, as the Segullah, or Peculiar People, consisted in having the Supreme Being appropriated to them for their God.

The Force of this Argument as applied by the Jews to their SCHISMATICKS from Judaism. I. The God of Israel was indeed so proper to the Israelites, as the Gods of the Nations were to their respective Nations. Sect. I. The Dæmons of the Nations were only of limited Power and Jurisdiction, and, as they thought, overpowered when the Nations, for whom they were concerned, were conquered. Sect. II, III. The Privilege of the Jews, as the Segullah, consisted in this, That whereas none but Inferior Dæmons were appointed for the Tutelars of other Nations, the Supreme Being was pleased to undertake the management of them immediately, in his own person. Sect. IV, V, VI,

The Contents.

VI, VII. *The Advantages the Jews had above other Nations in this regard.* Sect. VIII. *Wherein consisted the Sin of worshiping those Tutelary Demons.* Sect. IX, X, XI. *How Angels were employed by God in the Government of the Jews.* Sect. XII. *Wherein God's peculiar Care of the Jews consisted.* Sect. XIII.

p. 110

Chap. VII.

The way of Appropriating a God (according to the Customs of those Times) was by Sacrifices received in One Place, and from One Altar, and One High Priest.

2. *The way of appropriating a God to a Nation was by Sacrifice. Sect. I. The popular Sacrifices were to be considered as Ceremonies of Covenanting, and particularly of Covenanting with their Gods as well as with one another. Sect. II. These Sacrifices were confined to particular Nations. Sect. III. Especially their Mysteries. Sect. IV. The most Ancient Sacrifices were generally thus confined. Sect. V. How this was consistent with the Heathens*

The Contents.

thens permitting the Worship of the Gods of other Nations besides their own. Sect. VI. The Covenanting Symbols of Unity that were used in their Common Sacrifices. Sect. VII, VIII. The Sacrifices were also Natural Means of promoting this Unity of the Sacrificers with their Gods. Sect. IX. The Consequences following hereupon. Sect. X.

3. *The National Panegyres or Assemblies for participating in those National Sacrifices confined to a certain place. Sect. XI. Moses very probably alluded herein to the Practices of the Egyptians. Sect. XII.*

4. *In the Panegyres so fixed, all the Sacrifices then feasted on were to be received from One Altar. Sect. XIII. The Reason. Sect. XIV.*

5. *The Affairs of that One Altar always, managed by One Chief Priest. Sect. XV.*

p. 142

Chap. VIII.

The Jewish Sacrifices, as Mysteries, caused a Mystical Union and Communion with God, dependent on their External Communion with their High Priest.
The

The Contents.

The Jews, before our Saviour's coming, had taken up this way of mysticizing their Law. Sect. I. The Jewish Sacrifices were most properly Mysteries. Sect. II. How these Mystical Sacrifices promoted a Union with the Deity by a Union with the Priesthood. 1. The admitting Persons to the Mysteries was the peculiar Office of the High Priesthood. Sect. III. 2. In this Office the High Priests represented a more Sacred Person than their own. Sect. IV. The Dæmon peculiarly concerned in this affair of restoring Souls was the Demiurgus. Sect. V. It was thought impious for any Creature to intermeddle in it as a Creature. Sect. VI. The Jews understood their own Worship to perform the Office of Mysteries. Sect. VII. The λόγος was the Demiurgus peculiarly concerned in Revealing the Heavenly Mysteries. Sect. VIII. The Jewish High Priest represented the λόγος herein. Sect. IX, X. None but the High Priest did so. Sect. XI. 3. The High Priest represented the λόγος particularly in relation to the Benefits of the Mystical ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑ and Κοινωνία.

1. Union and Communion with the Father

The Contents.

Father was to be procured by Union and Communion with the Λόγος. Sect. XII. A mystical κοινωνία owned in the Hellenistical Philosophy of those Times. Sect. XIII. How appropriated to the Λόγος by the Principles of the same Philosophy. Sect. XIV. The same Λόγος the Principle of Union both to the Sensible World. Sect. XV. And to the Intellectual. Sect. XVI.

2. Union and Communion with the Λόγος was supposed to depend on external Communion with the High Priest as one who particularly represented the Λόγος in this Office of mystically signifying and causing this External Unity Sect. XVII.

p. 185

Chap. IX.

The Christian Bishops were answerable to the Jewish High Priests.

The Solidity of this same way of Reasoning as urged by the Primitive Christians against their contemporary SCHISMATICKS. The general Principles on which they proceeded were granted by the Generality of that Age. Sect. I. The way of Reasoning from

The Contents.

from Sacrifices admitted also under the Gospel. *Seēt. II.* The Reasoning from Mystical Sacrifices indeed most proper to the State of the Gospel. *Seēt. III.* The Primitive Bishops designed in imitation of the Jewish High Priesthood. Hence the Custom of their wearing Frontlets. *Seēt. IV.* And that of their confining the Succession in Churches to the Family of their first Bishops. *Seēt. V.* This Design very agreeable to the Change intended by our Saviour. *Seēt. VI.* An Account why, for a while, the Christians might defer the committing that eminency of Power into the Bishops hands with which they were intrusted afterwards. *Seēt. VII.* *VIII.* Hence also the Absoluteness of particular Bishops in S. Cyprian's time. *Seēt. IX.* However this same Reasoning will oblige all to a strict dependence who live within the same Jurisdiction. *Seēt. X.* The same way of Reasoning from Jewish Precedents will include whole Cities within the same Jurisdiction. *Seēt. XI.* How inclinable the Christians were to take up these Arts of Uniting Citizens. *Seēt. XII.* The Solemn Anniversaries of the Jews being continued among the Christians

The Contents.

Christians were to be understood as Obligatory in the Times of Christianity ; and their being observed in particular Cities implied that the Bishops of those Cities were answerable to the High Priests. *Seet. XIII.* p. 229

Chap. X.

The City Jurisdictions were Answerable to the Jurisdiction of the High Priest.

Tho Christians of the same City had been left to their Liberty whether they would unite, or not, yet, supposing them united, Subjects must have been obliged to their actual Terms of Union. *Seet. I.* 1. *In that Case, it must have been indifferent, and therefore Lawful, for them to unite so.* *Seet. II.* 2. *This way of Union being once agreed on, tho the Agreement had been only Human, yet the Obligation to Subjects and Posterity would have been Divine.* *Seet. III.* 3. *Tho the particular Instance had not, yet the Power by which even that Instance had been determined, had been from God.* *Seet. IV.* 4. *The Determination of the Limits of Jurisdiction was a thing absolutely necessary*

The Contents.

necessary for preserving Unanimity among themselves in propagating their common Christianity. *Sect. V. 5.* The most equal way of determining these Limits, among Equals, is that of Occupation. *Sect. VI, VII.* This way of determining them will not oblige us to a Recourse to express Scripture. *Sect. VIII.* All Church Members were obliged, by the ancient Canons, to a Personal Attendance at the Bishops Altar at some solemn Times. *Sect. IX.* The Ground of that Custom in the Jewish Precedent. *Sect. X.* p. 273

Chap. XI.

The Primitive Christians did, and, by the received Principles of those Times were obliged to own their Eucharist for a Mystical Sacrifice.

The Sacrifices and High Priesthood of the Gospel are Mystical. Sect. I. Such a Sacrifice necessary under the Gospel as may answer the publick Sacrifices under the Law. Sect. II. This Mystical Evangelical Sacrifice must be expected from some positive Institution of the Gospel. Sect. III. Eucharistical Sa-
crifices

The Contents.

crifices most suitable to the State of the Gospel. *Sect. IV.* Hence probably the very name of Eucharist. *Sect. V.* Christ's Priesthood being the Priesthood of Melchizedech, his Sacrifice ought also to be the Sacrifice of Melchizedech, that of Bread. *Sect. VI.* Not only this Reasoning, but the Inference deduced from it, were granted and used by the Ancients. *Sect. VII.* Supposing the Notions of those Times, they must needs have taken the Eucharist for a Mystical Sacrifice. *Sect. VIII.* On account of it's being a Mystical Sacrifice it had, according to the Principles of those Ages, a juster Title to the Name of a Sacrifice. *Sect. IX, X, XI.* And to the Thing. *Sect. XII, XIII.*

295

Chap. XII.

The same Christians did, and, by the same Principles, were obliged to, own their Bishops for Mystical High Priests.

The Bishops were thought to represent a Divine Person. The seven Angels of the Divine Presence had their Office in the

The Contents.

the restoring of Souls. Sect. I. To these S. John accommodated his precise number of seven Churches in Asia. Sect. II. Sometimes the Bishops represented the Person of Christ himself, and then his seven Angels are represented by the seven Deacons. Sect. III. How fitly this agreed to the Circumstances of the first Beginnings of Christianity. Sect. IV. The name Bishop seems originally designed to imply a Mystical Representative of a Divine Person. Sect. V. The Comparisons of the Bishops in Ignatius to God, and Christ, &c. accounted for. Sect. VI. The Mystical Representations of Ecclesiastical Officers in the Revelations. Sect. VII. There could be no Mistake in taking their Church Officers for Mystical Representatives. Sect. VIII. The force of the Inference relating to Union with Christian Bishops. Sect. IX. Tertullian's Futuri Judicii Præjudicium explained. Sect. X. How consequently the Primitive Christians reasoned hence for proving those who were disunited from their Bishops to be also deprived of the Mystical Invisible Union with Christ himself. Sect. XI. And of the Benefits of that Invisible Union.

The Contents.

Union. *Seēt. XII, XIII, XIV.*

p. 328

Chap. XIII.

The forementioned Reasoning applied to the present Case of our Modern
SCHISMATICKS.

The Applicableness of this same Reasoning to the Case of our Modern SCHISMATICKS. Gospel Constitutions designed perpetual. Seēt. I. Unity designed perpetual. Seēt. II. Even that of this Life. Seēt. III. Christ designed and instituted Means sufficient for perpetuating this External Unity. The same Means of erecting the Church into a Body-Politick as conducive to the perpetuating an External Unity Now (as Then) and for Ever. Seēt. IV. The Means of confining the Benefits of the Covenant to the Solemnities of it by Sacrifice as conducive to the same purpose of erecting a Body Politick now also, and for Ever. Seēt. V. Our Christian Sacrifice of the Eucharist is of a perpetual Use. Seēt. VI. And perpetually useful for the same purposes as in the Apostles

The Contents.

fles Time. *Sect. VII.* And therefore
 perpetually useful in order to the par-
 taking in the Invisible Heavenly Sacri-
 fice. *Sect. VIII.* No communica-
 ting with the Father and the Son but
 by Communion with the Bishop. *Sect.*
IX. This same Reasoning, if it was
 good in S. Cyprian's time, is still as
 good as it was then, and will be so for
 ever. *Sect. X.* These Symbolical Re-
 presentations are not otherwise to be in-
 terpreted Now than they were in the
 Primitive Times. *Sect. XI.* Our Ad-
 versaries, in their separate condition,
 can lay no claim to the One Altar. *Sect.*
XII. Nor to the One Priesthood.
Sect. XIII. The sad condition of
 SCHISMATICKS. *Sect. XIV.*
 How little Friends they are to Souls
 who are for prejudging persons against
 our Reasons by Popular Arts of raising
 Odium against our Cause, or our Per-
 sons. *Sect. XV.* *Sect. XVI.*

p. 68

A

A Summary of the Reasoning
presented in one View,
according to the Method
of the Book.

Premisals Preparatory.

1. **T**his way of Reasoning for Unity
from One Altar and One
Priesthood was deduced from the nearest
and freshest memory of the Apostles.
Chap. 1. Sect. 1.
2. This way of Reasoning is more likely to
have been taken up from Jewish Notions
than Heathenish. § 3.
3. It was usual for the Christians of that
Age to Reason from Jewish Prece-
dents. § 4.
4. Used in these very Particulars of their
Priesthood and Altar. § 5.
5. Used not only as Arguments ad Homi-
nes,

A Summary.

nes, but as such as were really conclusive of the things they were designed to prove. § 7.

6. Solid also as to this Particular, that this Priesthood and Altar ought Now, as well as among the Jews, to be Principles of Unity. Chap. II.

The Enquiry made first concerning the Solidity of this Reasoning as used by the Jews against the Samaritans.

The Assertion.

The Jews did condemn all Altars independent on their National Altar, and all Priesthoods independent on their Publick National High Priesthood, as prejudicial to their Unity.

1. Proved True. Chap. III, IV, V.
2. Accounted for as to the Reasoning by which it appears to have been True.
 1. The God of Israel was indeed so proper to the Israelites, as the Gods of the Nations were to their respective Nations. Chap. VI.
 2. The way of appropriating a God to a Nation was by Sacrifice. Chap. VII. to § 10.
 3. The National Panegyres or Assemblies, for participating in those National Sacrifices were confined to a certain place. ib. § 11, 12.

A Summary.

4. *In the Panegyres so fixed, all the Sacrifices then feasted on were to be received from One Altar.* ib. § 13, 14.
5. *The Affairs of that One Altar always managed by One Chief Priest.* ib. § 15.
6. *The Jewish Sacrifices were Mysteries as well as Sacrifices, and, in that regard, caused a Mystical, as well as a Civil, Union betwixt God and those who communicated in those Sacrifices.*
Chap. VIII.

1. *The Jews before our Saviour's coming, had taken up this way of mysticizing their Law.* ib. § 1.
2. *Particularly their Sacrifices were most properly Mysteries.* ib. § 2.
3. *These Mystical Sacrifices promoted a Union with the Deity by a Union with the Priesthood: For*
1. *The admitting Persons to the Mysteries was the peculiar Office of the High-Priesthood.* ib. § 3.
2. *In this Office the High Priests represented a more Sacred Person than their own, that is the Δόγμ.* § 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.
3. *The High Priest represented the Δόγμ particularly in relation to the Benefits of the Mystical Union and Communion. This proved:*

1. Union

A Summary.

1. Union and Communion with the Father was to be procured by Union and Communion with the Λόγος: § 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.
2. Union and Communion with the Λόγος was supposed to depend on External Communion with the High Priest as one who particularly represented the Λόγος in this Office of mystically signifying and causing this External Union. § 17.

The same Enquiry 2. concerning the Solidity of the same Reasoning as used by the Primitive Christians against their contemporary SCHISMATICKS.
Chap. IX.

1. The way of Reasoning from Sacrifices admitted also under the Gospel. § 2.
2. The Reasoning from Mystical Sacrifices was indeed most proper to the State of the Gospel. § 3.
3. The Primitive Bishops were designed in imitation of the Jewish High Priesthood. § 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.
4. This way of Reasoning will oblige all to a strict dependence who live in the same Jurisdiction. § 10.
5. The same way of Reasoning from Jewish

A Summary.

ish Precedents will include whole Cities within the same Jurisdiction. § 11, 12, 13.

6. *This measuring of the Jurisdiction of Churches by the Jurisdiction of Cities had been Just by the Right of Occupation, tho no Scripture-Precedent could have determined any thing concerning it.* Chap. X.

1. *In that Case it must have been indifferent, and therefore Lawful for them to unite so.* § 2.

2. *This way of Union being once agreed on, tho the Agreement had been only human, yet the Obligation to Subjects, and Posterity, would have been Divine.* § 3.

3. *Tho the particular Instance had not, yet the Power by which even that Instance had been determined, had been from God.* § 4.

4. *The Determination of the Limits of Jurisdiction was a thing absolutely necessary for preserving Unanimity among themselves in propagating their common Christianity.* § 5.

5. *The most equal way of determining these Limits, among Equals, is that of Occupation.* § 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

7. *The*

A Summary.

7. *The Mystical Sacrifice, Answering the Priesthood of the Bishop under the Gospel, was the Eucharist. Chap. XI.*

1. *The Sacrifices under the Gospel are Mystical. § 1.*

2. *Such Sacrifices are necessary under the Gospel as may answer the publick Sacrifices under the Law. § 2.*

3. *This Mystical Evangelical Sacrifice must be expected from some positive Institution under the Gospel. § 3.*

4. *Eucharistical Sacrifices are most proper to the State of the Gospel. § 4, 5.*

5. *Christ's Priesthood being the Priesthood of Melchizedec, his Sacrifice ought also to be the Sacrifice of Melchizedec, that of Bread. § 6, 7.*

6. *Supposing the Notions of those Times, the Ancients must needs have taken the Eucharist for a Mystical Sacrifice. § 8.*

7. *On account of its being a Mystical Sacrifice, it had, according to the Principles of those Ages, a juster Title both to the Name and Thing of a Sacrifice. § 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.*

8. *The High Priesthood, ascribed by the the Primitive Christians to their Bishops, was also Mystical. Chap. XII.*

The

A Summary.

The same Enquiry 3. concerning the Solidity of the same Reasoning with regard to the present Case of our Modern SCHISMATICKS. Chap. XII.

Proposition proved.

That the same Reasoning which was good in the Case of the Primitive Christians against SCHISM holds still good in the Case of our Modern SCHISMATICKS, and will hold good against SCHISM for ever.

1. Gospel Constitutions were designed perpetual. § 1.
2. Ecclesiastical Unity was also designed by God to be perpetual. § 2.
3. That Ecclesiastical Unity which was intended that it should be perpetual, was also to be understood of a Unity in this Life. § 3.
4. This Perpetuity being thus designed, it must follow that Christ designed and instituted Means sufficient for perpetuating this External Unity of this Life. § 4.

5. The

A Summary.

5. *The same Means of erecting the Church into a Body Politick, is as conducive to the perpetuating an External Ecclesiastical Unity Now (as Then) and for Ever. ib.*
6. *The Means of confining the Benefits of the Covenant to the Solemnities of it by Sacrifice, as conducive to the same purpose of erecting a Body-Politick Now also, and for Ever. § 5.*
7. *The Federal Sacrifice to which these Benefits of the Covenant are now confined is that of the Eucharist.*

Proved

1. *Our Christian Sacrifice of the Eucharist is of a perpetual Use.*
§ 6.
2. *It is perpetually useful for the same purposes as in the Apostles Times.*
§ 7.
3. *It is therefore perpetually useful in order to the partaking in the Invisible Heavenly Sacrifice. §. 8.*

8. No

A Summary.

8. *No communicating with the Father
and the Son but by Communion with
the Bishop.* § 9.
-

The

The same Reasoning more closely managed, and in some things improved.

Sacred Unity (to which SCHISM is opposed) is to be derived from ONE ALTAR and ONE Presiding PRIEST as Principles of Unity.

This proved true 1. From Hellenistical Principles as urged by the Jews against the Samaritans.

- 1. This Sacred Unity was designed originally to the Supreme Being as a Deity appropriated to the Segullah, or peculiar People.*
- 2. This Sacred Unity to the Supreme Being was to be transacted by a Covenant to be made with him by Sacrifice.*

A Summary.

3. *That Sacrifice which, by the Principles of those Ages, could unite with One God, was to be received from ONE and the same ALTAR.*
4. *The Affairs of that ONE ALTAR were, according to the Customs of those Times, generally managed by ONE Supreme Presiding PRIEST.*
5. *This Unity as Mystical was transacted by the Sacraments principally as Mysteries.*
1. *The Unity here designed is not barely an Rxternal One of this Life, but as conducing to an Invisible Unity of the other Life as transacted and procured by this Visible One.*
2. *This Invisible Union (which is here called Mystical) was properly to be expected only from Mysteries as that for which Mysteries were principally designed.*
3. *The way of transacting this Invisible Union in Mysteries was understood to be by Representing the Invisible Union by*

A Summary.

by Visible Symbols, and so obliging God, by virtue of those Symbols as Legal Ones, to ratifie invisibly what was transacted in their Visible Mysteries.

4. *This Mystical Union did most essentially consist in a Union to one common Head as a common Principle to all particulars so united of their Mystical Unity.*
5. *The way of uniting to this Archetypal Head, or Principle of Unity, as transacted in Mysteries, was by first uniting persons to an Image or Representative of the Archetypal Head, which was to be a common Head to all subordinate Representatives, as its Archetype was also a Head to itself and all united with it.*
6. *In this Multitude of subordinate Representatives, whoever was legally united to the last was, in the same way of Interpretation of Law, understood to be united to the first Archetypal Head of all.*

A Summary.

7. *The first Archetypal Head or Principle of all this Mystical Unity was thought to be the Supreme Being, the $\tau\alpha\chi\alpha\delta\omicron\nu$ as the Platonists called him, the $\delta\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \pi\alpha\sigma\iota$, or Father, as the Hellenists as well as the Primitive Christians called him, in opposition to the Son.*

8. *They who were united to the High Priest, by the Principles of these Hellenists, by being so united to the High Priest, were united also to the Father.*

1. *They who were united to the High Priest were also on that same account of this Mystical Reasoning, united also to the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$, of whom the High Priest was a designed Representative.*

2. *They who were united to the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ were, on the same Principles, united to the Father who was taken for the Head of the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$, and of whom the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$*

A Summary.

Λόγος was supposed to be the ἐκὼν or
ῥεαλιστής, that is the express and lively
Representative.

9. *They who communicated in the Sacrifices offered by the High Priest, They, and they alone, were, in this Legal way of Judging, supposed united to the High Priest.*

10. *They who communicated in Sacrifices offered by any of the Inferior Priests owning a dependence on the High Priest, were for so doing, judged to communicate in Sacrifices offered by the High Priest himself.*

11. *They who did not communicate at the One great Altar, where the High Priest was obliged to officiate in person, and where every clean Male was obliged to attend in person at the three great Anniversary Festivals, were, on that account, judged not to communicate in Sacrifices offered by the High Priest.*

A Summary.

12. *They who communicated with other Altars owning no dependence on that one great Altar in reference to their Anniversary Solemnities, were, for so doing, judged not to communicate in Sacrifices offered by the High Priest; and they who communicated with Altars owning such a dependence (as for Example with that of Heliopolis) were therefore judged to communicate with the One great Altar, on which they owned a dependence, and accordingly accounted of as if they communicated in the Sacrifices offered by the High Priest himself in person.*

13. *They who communicated in these Sacrifices and this ONE ALTAR were, in some way of Legal Interpretation, judged to communicate in the Archetypal Sacrifices, and the Archetypal ALTAR relating to the Archetypal High Priest who was represented by the Visible One.*

14. *They*

A Summary.

14. *They who thus communicated in the Archetypal Sacrifices and Altar were judged to be thereby united to the Archetypal High Priest, as by communicating in the Visible Sacrifices and Altar they were united to him that was Visible. I mean both to the immediate Archetypal the Λόγος, and to the Original, the Father also.*

15. *They who were thus united to the Archetypal High Priest became thereby intitled to all the Mystical Benefits of that Union.*

1. *As united to his person, so they were intitled to all those spiritual influences derived from Him as the Head to all his Mystical Body, answering the derivation of vital Influences from the Head to each particular Member in the natural Body. That is to the Spirit as a Principle of Spiritual or Mystical Life, answering the Animal Spirits in the Natural Body, both as*

A Summary.

it must assist them in the performance of their Duty, and as it withal infuses Supernatural Comforts when they have done it.

2. As united to his Sacrifice, so they come to be in Covenant with him, and to be intitled to all those Promises on God's part of the Covenant, which, by the Hellenists were thought Mystical as this New Covenant it self was so. Such were,

1. Remission of Sins, which by the Apostles Reasoning on those Principles, seems proper only to this Mystical Sacrifice.

2. Heaven answering the Literal Canaan, &c.

3. The deliverance of their Souls from the Slavery of their Bodies, and the Power of the Devil the Mystical Pharaoh and Egypt.

4. Especially with relation to their future State which was thought the proper work of Mysteries.

A Summary.

16. *They who were thus disunited from the sensible High Priest were, in a Legal Way of judging (which God, as transacting these things by Legal Covenanting Symbols, was obliged to ratifie) disunited also from the Archetypal High Priest, and his Sacrifice and Altar. And*

17. *Accordingly cut off from all Legal Right to the now mentioned Benefits of the Mystical Union; whether those of Union with the person, or with the Sacrifice, of this Archetypal Principle of Unity.*

18. *They who were disunited from the One Sensible Altar were also disunited from the One Sensible High Priest.*

19. *They who either owned another Rival Altar for their National Anniversaries, or another Altar independent on the publick National One, for even their less publick Solemnities, were, for so doing, judged disunited from the One*
d 4
Sensible

A Summary.

Sensible Altar *which was ingredient in the Principle of their External Unity.*

2c. *They who were, on any of these accounts, disunited from the One Sensible Altar were also, by the same Principles of Reasoning described in other Instances, judged disunited from the Archetypal Altar, and its Sacrifices, and the Covenant to be made; or the other Benefits to be impetrated, by those Sacrifices.*

3. *From the same Principles as received and ratified by the Primitive Christians, and urged by them to their contemporary SCHISMATICKS.*

Here I premise.

1. *That the Reasoning from Old Testament to Gospel Institutions is allowed in the New Testament it self.*
2. *Even where a Change was made under the Gospel from the Old Testament*
ment ✓

A Summary.

ment Precedent, yet even there the same Reasoning is allowed from the Old Testament Type to the New Testament Antitype.

3. *This way of Reasoning from Old Testament Types to New Testament Antitypes requires, that tho the Things be changed, yet still they remain the same in proportion.*

4. *Their remaining the same in proportion requires that the Antitypes perform the same Office in the New Testament as the Types did under the Old.*

5. *This way of Reasoning from Old Testament Precedents to New Testament Institutions is allowed under the Gospel in these very Instances of the Priesthood and the Altar.*

Now then for proving the Proposition, it followed,

1. *That there ought under the Gospel also*
to

A Summary.

to be One Altar and One Priest answerable to those under the Law. And that it was actually true was granted by the Primitive Christians.

2. This One Priest under the Gospel who was thought answerable to the Jewish High Priest was the Bishop, and the One Altar among the Christians answering to the One Jewish Altar at Jerusalem was the Communion Table where the Bishop himself officiated in person.

3. The Bishop therefore and his Communion Table was to perform the same Office to Christians, as the Jewish Altar and Priesthood had performed among the Jews.

4. The Bishop therefore and his Communion Table were to be Principles of Unity to Christians, as the High Priest and his Altar were formerly to the Jews.

A Summary.

5. *As this Unity here spoken of was a Mystical Unity, so there was more reason to expect it from the Bishop and his Communion-Table than from the High Priest and his Altar.*
1. *This Mystical Unity was most properly to be expected from Mysteries, and therefore from such Sacrifices as were Mystical Sacrifices, and by so much the rather to be expected from them by how much the more Mystical they were.*
2. *The Christian Eucharist was, and was believed to be, a Mystical Sacrifice, and more properly Mystical than the Jewish Sacrifices themselves.*
3. *The Christian Bishops were, and were also believed to be, Mystical High Priests, and as properly so as the Jewish High Priests were believed to be so by the Hellenists.*
4. *Among Mysteries those were judged to have most Mystical Virtue which approached*

A Summary.

preached nearest to the Archetypal Mysteries.

5. *The Christian Eucharist and their Bishop were, by the Primitive Christians judged to approach nearer to the Archetypal Sacrifice and High Priest than the Jewish Altar and Sacrifice and High Priest.*

6. *This mystical Unity was that which was thought to be the most beneficial Unity, and that indeed alone which related to the Good of Souls, and the future State.*

7. *This mystical Unity was indeed most proper to Christianity as a State of mystical Israelitism, and as designed by Christ himself with a particular regard to the good of Souls, and a future State.*

8. *The Mischiefs therefore supposed to be incurred by these Violators of Christian Unity, were of the same sort with those to which the Heathens thought them obnoxious who were Violators of their Mysteries.*

1. The

A Summary.

1. *The Heathens thought the Violators of their Mysteries in danger of a present Punishment from their offended Deity, either of Sickness or Death, as the Christians thought concerning their own unworthy Communicants.*

2. *The Heathens thought them under an $\alpha\gamma\sigma$ or Piaculum, and so obnoxious to the hauntings of Furies and ill Dæmons, as the Christians Excommunication was accounted a Delivery of such persons unto Satan, by whom the Corporal Evils were inflicted.*

3. *As the Mysteries were themselves thought advantageous for the $\alpha\gamma\sigma$ of the return of the Soul to Heaven, so the want of them was supposed to leave them in the $\beta\omicron\sigma\beta\omicron\sigma$ the mire of these Terrestrial Vehicles which were thought to detain them, and make them incapable of ascending to their Heavenly Happiness. Which was also agreeable to the Sentiments of the Primitive Christians concerning excommunicate persons.*

9. *Whosoever set up another Altar for the publick*

A Summary.

publick Assemblies within the Bishop's Jurisdiction distinct from that of the Bishop (as in the case of SCHISMATICAL Bishops in a See already occupied) were, on the same account guilty of the Violation of this mystical Unity among Christians as the Abettors of the Samaritan Altar and High-Priesthood in opposition to those of Jerusalem were among the Jews.

10. They also who set up Altars within the Bishop's Jurisdiction independent on his Altar, as in the Case of Rebelling Presbyters were also, on the same account, guilty of the Violation of this mystical Unity among Christians, as the Abettors of Jeroboam's high places in opposition to the celebration of the Solemn Anniversaries at Jerusalem were among the Jews.

11. As every Bishop was thought answerable to the High Priest at Jerusalem ; so every City with its Jurisdiction was thought answerable to the Jurisdiction of Jerusalem.

12. Tho there had been no such Right for

A Summary.

for determining the Limits of Jurisdiction from the Old Testament Precedent, yet Occupation had been sufficient, when proceeding on such common Rules of Equity as had been at first agreed on, and between Equals.

13. He who, by any of the Cases now described, had been disunited from the Communion of any one Bishop, had been also disunited from the Communion of the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron$, that is, in the Language of those Christians, of Christ the Invisible Bishop.

14. Whoever was thereby disunited from Christ the Invisible Bishop, was accordingly indeed, and in Right, disunited from all Bishops of the Catholic Church, who were accordingly obliged, on account of the preservation of their common Correspondence and Unity, to exclude him from their own particular Communion, also respectively.

15. The preservation of the Unity of each particular Church was the common Interest of all particulars.

16. The

A Summary.

16. *The Violation of the Unity of any one particular Church was, in Consequence, a Violation of the Unity of all particular Churches.*

17. *The Violation of the Unity of all particular Churches is, by a necessary Consequence, the Violation of the Unity of the whole Catholick Church [in general.*

3. *From this same Reasoning as holding good still, and as applicable also to the Case of our Modern SCHISMATICKS.*

Proved as in the Former Summary.

THE

T H E

INTRODUCTION.

T H E C O N T E N T S.

How the Ancients reasoned for Unity of Communion from the Unity of the Priesthood, and the Unity of the Altar. Sect. I. Mr. Baxter makes them reason quite contrary to the Design and Interest of their Cause. Sect. II. An account of his way of managing this same Reason. Sect. III. This Reasoning of no force, but as design'd by the Ancients, who used it. Who neither could design the Inferences deduced thence by Master Baxter. Sect. IV. Nor could design the Premises true in such a sense as that the Inferences would follow from them whether they would or no. Sect. V. The Design of the present Discourse. Sect. VI.

THe *Unity of the Catholick Church in* Sect. I.
opposition to the separate Con-
venticles of *SCHISMATICKS*,
B is

The Introduction.

is (in the Language of the most ancient and accurate Writers against *SCHISM*, especially *Ignatius* and *S. Cyprian*, from whom *later Antiquity* has received the same Terms) expressed as grounded on the *Unity* of the *Priest* and the *Altar*. In which way of *Reasoning* they conclude, that they who partake at the *same Altar*, and of the *same mystical Sacrifices* offered thereon, and receive their portions of this *Sacrificial Feast* from the Ministry of the *same Priest*, whose Office it is to offer those *mystical Sacrifices* on that *same Altar*, that *they*, and *they alone*, are to be judged to belong to the *same Society*, confederated by those *Sacrifices*. And on the contrary, that they who set up *other Altars* in opposition to that *one Altar*, in order to the confederation of *distinct Societies*, owning no correspondence with the *Original Altar*: and they who set up a *distinct Priesthood* by themselves, owning no *dependence* on the *Priest* related to that *Altar*, cannot, by virtue of this *Sacrificial Confederation* be judged to belong to the *original Society*, nor can consequently be intitled to the *Privileges* of the *Society* from which they are so divided. This *One Altar* those *Ancients* understand of the *Original*

The Introduction.

3

nal Communion, and the one Priest of the Bishop who was possessed of the Church when the Separation was first made; And accordingly conclude farther, that whoever keep not to the original Communion, and do not own the Authority of such a Bishop and his Canonical Successors within his own Jurisdiction, are, for these very Reasons, cut off from the Original Churches, and from all just and legal Claims to the spiritual Promises and Privileges of Churches.

THESE Things, one would think, *Sect. 2.* should be very plain, as to the Case of our present Nonconforming Adversaries. And yet it is strange to see how extremely partial men, otherwise well meaning, are, when tempted by the Interest of a beloved Cause and Party. And I know not whether we have a greater instance of this human Frailty than *Mr. Baxter*. He it is that will needs persuade us, that this very same Reasoning which was made use of by those Fathers, for proving all those *Diocesan Societies and Assemblies SCHISMATICAL*, which are maintained in opposition to the *Diocesan Bishop*, does indeed prove the contrary; That in that very same Case it proves that the *Diocesan* is the only *SCHISMA*.

TICK. This had indeed been more excusable, if he had taken the Argument singly, and vindicated it from the unskilfullness of their management of it. Then he might indeed pretend to shew, with some consistency to his own undertakings, that it did prove the *contrary* to that for which the *Ancients* had produced it. But when he is not content with this, but will needs pretend further, that his *Doctrine*, as well as his *Reasoning*, is the *Doctrine* also of *Ignatius*, and *S. Cyprian*; That *they* as well as *he*, were for defending subdivided *Diocesan Assemblies* against the Authority of their *Diocesan*; That *they* as well as *he*, charged the *Diocesans* (that was *themselves*, in the Cases concerned in their Disputes) with the *SCHISM* of such *Divisions*; That accordingly *they*, as well *he*, should *unchurch* the *Diocesan Ordinaries* for not allowing the Exercise of Discipline by *Felicissimus*, and such like *Presbyters* independently on *Ordinaries*, within their *Ordinaries Jurisdiction*, for not owning such divided *Factions* and *Assemblies* headed by *single Presbyters* for *proper Churches*, and intitled to the *Privileges* that were proper to truly *Ecclesiastical Assemblies*; that
is

is indeed that their whole Disputes were by *themselves* designed *against themselves*, and in favour of their *Adversaries*: it is very strange how he could be so confident of so weak Conjectures as those are which he uses in a Case, of it self, so extremely *incredible*. But such gross mistakes as these they are usually guilty of, who will venture rather to expound Authors by single *Expressions*, not throughly understood, than inquire into the true *History* of the *Dispute*, and the matter of Fact that occasioned it, and the *Interest* and true *design* of the *Dispute* it self, as fitted to the *Case* for which it was designed.

A PARADOX so incredible *Sect. 3.* one would expect should be confirmed by very full and convincing Evidence. Yet all he has to shew for it, is, that those *Ancients* limit this *Unity* by *one Altar*, that is, as he conceives, by *one single Communion-Table*; and by *one Priest*, that is, as he also understands it, by *one single Ordinary Minister*. Whence he concludes, that the notion of a *single united Church* then included no more than could ordinarily maintain *Personal Communion from the same Table* that could ordinarily assist the Ministry

The Introduction.

of one *single Minister*, and ordinarily meet in the *same place*, even in those primitive Times of *Persecution*, when it could not be safe for *many* to meet so. He concludes, that this being so, whosoever were *thus united* in a *single Congregation*, and under the *personal* care and inspection of a *single Minister*, must consequently have been *united* to a *Church*, and could not be judged *SCHISMATICKS* for want of any other Terms of *Union*. He concludes, that the *Union* of *Diocesan Churches*, supposing *many Congregations* thus *united* among *themselves*, cannot accordingly involve such *Congregations* in the Crime of *SCHISM*, if they refuse those *further Terms of Union*, whilst they yet retain the *Union* of *one Altar* and *one Priest*, which was then thought *Catholick*, and from which alone the *Reasonings* now mentioned made it *SCHISMATICAL* to depart. That this being so, the *Diocesans* themselves, if they refuse *Communion* to *Congregations* so *united*, or, which amounts to the same thing, *impose* their *own Terms of Union* on them (which on these suppositions, cannot be *Catholick*) must *themselves* be judged to be the *Violators* of *Catholick Unity*,

Unity, and *SCHISMATICKS*, not those Congregations whom he supposes to do no more than assert their own just Liberty against *Usurpation* and *Uncatholick Impositions*; That this being the present Case of our *Nonconformists*: they are also justifiable, on the same Principles, from the Guilt of *SCHISM*.

BUT enough has been already said *Sect. 4.* for overthrowing the force of this Argument. I design not to repeat any more of it than what is absolutely necessary for preparing the way to my present undertaking. It is first plain, that this whole Argument can have no other force than what it must derive from the Authority of those ancient Authors who first used it. The very expressing of the notion of *Catholick Unity* by one Altar, and one Priest, is not taken from the Language of the *New Testament*. Hence it follows further, that this whole Reasoning depending wholly on the Authority of them who first used it, cannot consequently hold in any Cases but those for which they design'd it, & must undoubtedly be false in all such other Cases for which it was impossible that they could design it. These things therefore being thus premised, several things have been

already suggested to shew, that in the *Judgment* of the *Ancients* no such Consequences could be *designed*, as our Adversaries are in *interest* concerned to draw from this way of Reasoning. It has been shewn that they could not possibly *oppose*, or *defend* the *same things* that are hence opposed and defended by our Adversaries. They could not possibly *oppose* *Diocesan Churches*, because their own were so, as properly as ours are now. They took in *whole Cities*, how *populous* soever, and how *full* soever of *Christians*, together with the whole *Jurisdications* belonging to those *Cities*. Those *Cities* were as *great* and *populous*, and as full of *Converts* to one *Communion* as ours are now; nor can our Adversaries produce one single instance wherein the *numbers* of *Converts* made them subdivide *one City* into *several Churches* independent on the *Jurisdiction* of the *whole*, as they must have been by the Principles on which our Adversaries proceed in this Case. And which is very considerable in this matter, those very *Cities* of those *Countries*, which were first converted by the *Apostles*, of *Palestine*, and *Syria*, and the lesser *Asia*, and *Greece*, were generally very

See my second Letter, Sect. 7.

very great and populous, and suddenly filled with *multitudes* of *Christians*. Yet even there we never find that the *Apostles* themselves thought that *multitude* a sufficient reason for *multitudes* of independent *Jurisdications*; nor can we find the least *Footsteps* of any such *original* *Constitutions*, even in those *Churches* themselves, as far as any warrantable *Histories* can inform us. Nor could they possibly defend the *independance* of particular *Congregations* on *Diocesan Jurisdiction*, that being the very case of the *Adversaries* which whom they had to deal. *Ignatius* plainly disputes against all *Sacraments*, without the *consent* of the *Bishop*, and does as plainly include *Presbyters* in the number of those whom he makes *subject* to the *Bishop*. How then is it possible, by his Principles, that there could be any *Priest* or *Altar* in a *City* independent on the *Bishop*? S. Cy-
Second Letter 2-
gainst Mr.
Baxter.
Sect. 2.
prian does not only (from these Principles) condemn the *opposite* *Assemblies* of *Presbyters* against their *Bishops*, but even of *Anti-Bishops* themselves. What greater assurance can we desire that he thought all *City Altars*, and all *City Priests*, of what rank soever, obliged to a strict dependence on the common
ib. Sect. 32.
Church

Church of the City, and on their common Bishop, who already was canonically possessed of the City Jurisdiction? That was generally the Case with the Novatians and the Donatists. And why should they interpret the separate Assemblies of such persons to be an erecting an Altar against an Altar, if they had thought them to stand on equal Terms, if they had not thought all City Assemblies obliged to a dependence on the common City Altar and Bishop? Where no Duty is owing, the erection of a new Altar cannot be interpreted as an opposition to the old one. Thus Mr. Baxter and his Brethren argue. And thus would those Fathers also have argued, if they had been of Mr. Baxter's mind.

Sect. 5. T H U S impossible it was, that those Fathers could design the Consequences deduced from their Principles by our present Separatists. Nor could they understand the Principles themselves in any such meaning as that the Consequences should naturally follow from them, whether they would or no. When this appears, there will no pretence remain for our Adversaries misunderstanding them. They mention indeed but one Priest in a Church, but they make him assisted with Colleges

Colleges of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*. Who sees not that by the *one Priest* they could not mean *ordinary Ministers*, but only the *City-Bishop*? Yet these very expressions Mr. B. can occasionally quote, without observing how they make against him. Their mentioning such *Colleges* plainly implies, that they did not think the *one Priest* obliged to perform all his care in his *own person*. If that had been *possible* for him, and they had thought him so *obliged*; what need had there been of so many *Assistants*? And what will then become of the greatest part of Mr. *Baxter's* Reasonings? They mention *One Altar*, yet at the same time they mention several *Communion Tables*, which will utterly overthrow their *Inference*, that they must therefore have consisted of *single Assemblies*. This has been lately proved against them by a most Learned Adversary. He proves it from S. *Augustine*, than whom, none does more largely insist on this Argument in his Disputes against his contemporary *Donatists*. I have also elsewhere shewn, that even by the Principles of *Ignatius*, and others of the first Ages, *Presbyters* were also allowed the power of administering the

Dr. Silling.
Unreason.
of Separat.
Part 3. S. 9.

Second
Letter a-
gainst Mr.
Baxter.
Sect. 53.

the Lord's Supper by the *Bishop's* leave. What matter is it whether there were *standing Altars* in the several places of such Administrations? Tho there had been none, it will not thence follow that there were no *different Assemblies*. I have shewn how great *multitudes* might have communicated from the *same Altar*, greater than could ordinarily meet in the *same Assemblies*, especially in such *times* of Jealousie and Persecution. If these things be thus understood, as they were understood by the *Ancients*, it is easie to foresee what little ground will remain for our Adversaries *Inferences*.

Sett. 6.

W H A T then will remain further to be added on this Argument that has not yet been sufficiently explained? A *positive* account of the true *occasion* and *design* of the use of these *Phrases*, from whence we are to understand the meaning of the *Ecclesiastical Writers* in using them, and may judge both of the *Truth* of their *Principles*, and the *solidity* of the *Inferences* by them deduced from these Principles in this matter, and may also judge how applicable these *Reasonings* are to the Case of our present *Non-conformists*. When these things are cleared, I know not what can be desired

fired further for clearing the *solidity* of our present *Applications*.

C H A P. I.

The Solidity of the way of Reasoning from Jewish Precedents in these very Instances of their Priesthood and Altar.

The Contents.

1. *This way of Reasoning for Unity from one Altar, and one Priesthood was deduced from the nearest and freshest memory of the Apostles. Sect. I. This being granted will be sufficient to shew that the condemnation of SCHISM on these Principles must needs have been agreeable to the Sense of the Apostles themselves: Sect. II.*
2. *This way of Reasoning is more likely to have been taken up from Jewish Notions than Heathenish. Sect. III. How usual it was for the Christians of that Age to reason from Jewish Precedents. Sect. IV. Used in these very Particulars of their Priesthood and Altar,*

Chap. I.

Altar, by S. Clemens Romanus. Sect. V.
By S. Paul himself. Sect. VI. Used
not only as Arguments ad Homines;
but as such as were really conclusive of
the Things they were designed to prove.
Sect. VII.

Sect. I.

FIRST therefore I observe, that this way of reasoning for *Unity* from *one Altar*, and *one Priest* was not first taken up in the *later Ages* of the Church, but deduced from the nearest and freshest memory of the *Apostles*. *Ignatius* himself, who lived in their times, and was conversant with them, and was by them made *Bishop of Antioch*, we see uses it. Had it been taken up in *Ecclesiastical Times*, the Reasoning would rather have been from the Terms that were *more familiar* and *usual* in the custom of the Church to others that were *less familiar*, as from *Principles* more easily granted, and better understood, by the *vulgar*. They would rather have proved the necessity of *one Priest* from the necessity of *one Bishop*, because this *later* was in the *later usage* of the Church, the much more *usual* name by which that Office was known.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 15

known. That therefore they take the *Chap. 1.*
contrary way of *Reasoning*, it is a plain
sign, that when this Argument was first
taken up, it was better known what
was meant by *Priest* and *Altar*, than
what was meant by *Bishop* and *Communion Table*; and that it was more easily
granted, that the *Unity* of the *Priesthood*
and *Altar* did oblige to *Unity* of *Communion*, than that the *Unity* of the *Bishop*
and *Communion Table* did so. This way
of Reasoning is plainly accommodated
to the first *beginnings* of *Christianity*,
when the *Duties* of *Christianity* were ra-
ther to be gathered from Concessions *an-*
tecedent to *Christianity*, than to be re-
commended by its *own authority*. Which
Observation will withal add much to the
Validity of the *Reasoning*, that it was
first taken up before the extraordinary
Gifts of *Inspiration* ceased, and in fresh
memory of the *Apostles* themselves, up-
on the first appearing of the Case of
actual SCHISM.

BEFORE the Case of *actual SCHISM* *Sect. 2.*
it is unreasonable to expect *express Cen-*
sures of the *sin* of *SCHISM*. And
if immediately upon the *first* appearance
of the Case, they proceeded on *these*
Principles in condemning it, and withal
the

.. Chap. I. the Case appeared before the memory of the *Apostles Doctrine* could have been forgotten; then it will plainly follow that these were the Principles by which those *earliest Ages* were directed, in judging concerning the sense of the *Apostles*. Either therefore the *Apostles* left no certain *Principles* for preservation of *Unity* in the *Churches* instructed by them, or we must suppose those Principles forgotten in so short a distance of time; or we shall have reason to believe that these were the *Principles* and *Reasonings* on which the *Apostles* themselves would have proceeded in judging concerning this Case, if it had fallen out in their own time, and they had thereupon been obliged to give their own judgment concerning it. This *Consequence* will hold, tho the *Apostles* had delivered nothing concerning it from *express Revelation*. For in such Cases the *Providence* of God plainly supposed that other means of *human Information* were sufficient, when it did not undertake to secure them from the errors of such *Popular Reasonings*, especially where the Errors would have proved of so dangerous *Consequence* as they must in such a Case as this concerning the obligation to *Unity*.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 17

Unity. But in such a Case wherein the *Chap. 1.*
Apostles had been left to their own Reasonings, we see it is usual for them to reason from *Popular Notions* received among the *Hellenistical Jews*. And therefore all such Reasonings from *Notions* so received in the *Apostles times*, must be granted to have been secure from actual Errors. Whence it will further follow, that the *Reasonings* of the *next Age* from *Notions* popularly received in the *first Age*, must have been the *same*; and therefore as *certain*, as if they had been used by the *Apostles themselves*, thus unassisted by *actual Inspiration*, and indeed as *infallible* as *Inspiration* it self, when this was the only reason why *Inspiration* was not given them, because the *Inspirer* thought these Reasonings sufficient without it to secure them from *actual Error*, in such a Case wherein he was so *obliged* to secure them.

SECONDLY therefore I observe *Seet. 3.*
 further, That as this *Reasoning* was, as I said, taken from *Notions antecedent* to *Christianity*; so much more probably from *Judaism* than *Heathenism*, tho both of them had *Altars* and *Priests* among them. For *Heathenism* was a Religion
C
wholly

Chap. I. wholly condemned by the *Christians*, and therefore utterly unfit to give any *Authority to Reasonings for positive Constitutions*. But *Judaism* was a way of which the first *Christians* were always very cautious of speaking *disbonorably*. Most of the first *Converts* were *Jews* by *Nation*, and still retained a great reverence for the *Constitutions of the Old Testament*, and therefore with them such *Reasonings from Old Testament Precedents* must have been very prevalent. Besides the whole *History of the New Testament Disputes*, *S. James's Words* are very full to this purpose, *Act. 21. 20.* not to trouble my self with naming more. Accordingly the first *Converters* utterly disowned any design of *abrogating the Law*. Our *Saviour* himself professed he came not to *destroy*, (a) but to *fulfil* it. And one principal inducement made use to bring them over to the *Christian Religion*, was indeed, that *Moses* (b) in whom they trusted, had given *Testimony* to our *Saviour*, that of him all the *Prophets* (c) had *born witness*, &c. And therefore all the change they owned from the *Ancient Establishments*, was not pretended to be from *Judaism* to another *Religion*, but only from a *Literal* to a *Mystical*

(a) S. Mat.

5. 17.

Luke 16.

17.

(b) S. John

5. 45.

(c) A. R. 10.

43.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 19

a *Mystical Judaism*; from a *Circumcision*, Chap. I. in the *Flesh*, (d) to a *Circumcision* in the *Spirit*; from being the *Seed of Abraham's Flesh*, to being the *Seed of his* (e) *Faith*, which he had being yet uncircumcised. And this state of *mystical Judaism* it self they prove from Testimonies of the *Old Testament* it self, as proper to the *New Covenant* to be made with them in the later days, in that μέλλων ὧν of which their so much expected *Messias* was to be *Prince*. This they performed so fully, as that upon the whole they made it appear, that the *Literal Judaism* it self was only design'd to shadow the *Mystical* as that which was principally designed by the *Holy Ghost*, and the *Sacred Writers* themselves.

(d) Eph. 2. 11.
Rom. 2. 28, 29.
(e) Rom. 4. 1, 11.

PURSUANT hereunto whatsoever Sect. 4. benefit was boasted of by the *Jews* in their Disputation, they shew that the same also belonged to *Christianity* in a sense much more *beneficial*, tho *mystical*, as indeed more proper to a state of *mystical Judaism*. Nor do they only accommodate their own *Constitutions* to the ancient *Predictions* (that was easier, tho there had been no relation between them) but they also *reason* from them as often

Chap. I. as they had any new occasion from the Controversies of that Age. And considering the Principles they proceeded on, the Reasoning was indeed very *solid* and *prudent*. For this being granted, that the things which befel the Patriarchs, *happened to them as Ensamples*, and were written for the *Admonition* of the Age of the Apostles, upon whom the *Ends of the World* (so much spoken of by the Prophets) were come; That whatsoever was written, was written *designedly* for the instruction of those *later Ages*; That it was suitable to the way of *Prophecy* to foretel and command by way of *mystical Representations*; That all the *external Worship* of the *Jews* was design'd by the *Holy Ghost* himself like so many *Prophetick Visions* to represent and shadow the Duties of those in whose times the Prophecies were to be fulfilled and understood; It was indeed as proper and reasonable for them to infer their Duties from *mystical Interpretations* of the *Levitical Worship*, as it was constant and customary for *Prophets* to gather their own Duties from their own *Visions*, and from *mystical Interpretations* of their own *Visions*, when together with the *Visions* themselves the
Interpretations

1 COR. 10.

11.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 21

Interpretations were also revealed to Chap. 1. them. However as to us, it may suffice that these *Principles* are plainly supposed, and this way of *Reasoning* plainly allowed and proceeded on in most of the Disputes of the *New Testament*, not only for the *Conviction* of *Adversaries*, but for *Information* of *themselves*, as the Reasonings on which the credit of *Christianity* it self was recommended and received by most of the Converts of those Ages, as those upon which the *Apostles* themselves believed it, as those which were suggested to them by that *Inspiration* by which they were guided in their *Preachings*, and therefore must have been *solid*, if any thing was so, I do not say in *Christian*, but in any other sort of *received Revelations*.

I WILL not now digress to other Sect. 5. Instances, having elsewhere given several. I shall at present confine my self to those of the *Priesthood*, and the *Altar*, which are the more immediate Subject of my present Discourse. Even these very Terms are *mystically* applied to *Christianity* by Authors of *Ignatius's* Age, who notwithstanding wrote before him, and particularly so applied when they had occasion to reason from the

Chap. I. Levitical Patterns to deduce Obligations under the Christian Religion. Thus *Clemens Romanus* reasons to the *Corinthians*. From the budding of

Ep. 1. ad
Corinth.
Sect. 43,
44.

Aaron's Rod in Testimony of the Divine Election of *Aaron* and his Posterity to the Priesthood, he proves the like Sacredness of the Episcopal Office among the *Corinthians*, that the gifted Laicks might not presume to take that Calling upon them without the like Authority derived from Men impowered by God to give it them. From the Subordinations of the

Ib. Sect. 40.
41.

Temple, first of the High Priest, then of the Ordinary Priests, then of the Levites, last of all of the People, he infers a necessity of the like Subordination of the *Corinthian Laity* to their Bishops and Deacons. From the set place and time

Ib. Sect. 48.

of offering the Levitical Sacrifices in the Temple, which it was peculiar in any of them to transgress, he urges a like Duty of observing the set times and places of Ecclesiastical Assemblies. How very differently from our modern Adversaries, who are so far from admitting such Consequences as these, as that, if any thing, even of Decency, or moral Prudence, was observed under the Law, they immediately disclaim it as Levitical,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 23

cal, and, for no other Reason than it's *Chap. 1.*
having been observed *then*, decry it's
obligation under the *Gospel*.

YET not *S. Clemens* only (who yet *Sett. 6.*
had incomparably more advantages for
knowing the *Apostles* mind than these
men) but the *Apostle* himself allows
and observes the same *Reasoning*, and in
the very same *Instances* for which I am
at present concerned of *Priest* and *Altar*.
So he argues for the Right of mainte-
nance, *That they who minister about holy*
things, live of the things of the Temple; *1 Cor. 9.*
and they which wait at the Altar are parta- *13, 14.*
kers with the Altar. That even so
bath the Lord ordained, that they which
preach the Gospel, should live of the Go-
spel. Plainly supposing that our *Clergy*
answers the *Levitical Priesthood*, our
Churches their *Temple*, our *Communion-*
Table their *Altar*; and that what was
thought *equal* in their Case in the Pro-
visions of the *Old Testament* is for that
very reason to be taken for *ordained* in
the Case of the *Gospel-Ministry*. There
is no other *Evangelical Ordinance* so
much as pretended for it in that whole
Chapter. If there had, there had been
no need of so many *Reasons* to recom-
mend it. Yet this very Reasoning is

Chap. I. rejected as *Levitical* in us by those Enthusiasts who oppose the Right of this worldly maintenance. But so far is the Apostle from their mind in this particular, as that he allows a higher obligation to this way of arguing from the *Precedent* of the *Levitical Priesthood*. He reasons from the *Aaronical* to the *Melchizedechian Priesthood*, from the *Priesthood* of mortal men to the *immortal*

Heb. 5.4,5. *Priesthood* of the Son of God. No man took the honor of the *Levitical Priesthood* unto himself, but he that was called of God, as was *Aaron*. So also *Christ* glorified not himself to be made an *High Priest*, &c. And every *High Priest* is ordained to offer Gifts and Sacrifices. Wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer. And as none had Right to eat of the *Jewish Altar* but *Israelites*, so when he is to prove that *Literal Israelitism* is not the *Israelitism* that can challenge *Privileges*, he does it by this Argument, that *We have an Altar* whereof they have no right to eat which serve the *Tabernacle*.

Heb. 13.
10.

Seet. 7. THUS customary it was in those earlier Times to reason from *Levitical Precedents* in these very Instances. And if we consider what stress was laid on such

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 25

such Arguments, there will be reason to *Chap. I.*
believe them not only prudent, *ad homi-*
nes, considering the Concessions of
those with whom they had to deal, but
solid as to the Reasons of the *Things*
themselves. They were the very in-
ducements upon which most of the *Jews*
received their very *Christianity* (to
which they had been disposed before by
the *mystical Expositions* of the *Essens* and
Hellenists, very soon after the Scriptures
of the *Old Testament* had been translated
into the *Greek*, by the procurement of
Philadelphus) and such *inducements* as
that it is probable many of them had
never been converted, but upon these In-
ducements. And these *Jews* were at first
the only *Converts*, and those who were
made use of for the *conversion* of *others*.
How requisite therefore was it that the
grounds on which *themselves* believed
should be solid and substantial? Be-
sides Arguments *ad homines* are only
made use of for a time, till the person
be disposed for better conviction, by re-
ceiving the whole *Systeme* to which he
is to be *profelyted*. Till then it may be
prudent to reason with him on Principles
which he does at *present* more *firmly*
believe, tho he has less *reason* to do so,
that

Chap. I. that he may not be confounded with too many Disputes at first. But when upon a more thorow understanding of the Doctrine, he finds those *first Inducements* either *false* or *erroneous*, his belief then of the same Conclusion must be grounded thenceforward on *Principles* proper to the Systeme to which he is converted. But these kind of Reasons we find made use of, not only by *Converts* at *first*, but *after* their Conversion; not only by persons not *thoroughly instructed*, but by such as were of *greatest* *repute* for their *Skill* in *Christianity*, even by the *Apostles* themselves; not only in their Debates with *Unbelievers*, but with them also who were Proficients in the *Christian Religion*. Indeed these mystical Reasonings were thought properest for *Proficients*, as appears by the Apostle's Digression, *Heb. 5.* from *verse 11.* to the beginning of *Chapter 7.* where his whole Discourse concerning the backwardness of those he writes to, is only to make way to shew how unqualified they were for the *mystical* Discourse that follows concerning *Melchizedec*. And it was the Privilege (in the ordinary way of Instruction) to acquaint such as were *initiated* in their *Mysteries*,
with

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 27

with the fullest Discoveries of the true *Chap. 1.*
Designs and Reality of Things. Besides
the Apostles generally in their *proofs* of
new Discoveries, in their *Debates* with *A&.* 15.
each other, use this same way of *mysti-*
cal Reasoning, a plain sign that even in
those *inspired Ages*, it was more believ-
ed than the *Apostles* themselves.

C H A P. I I.

*The Solidity of the same Topick, as to
the Principles of this Unity.*

The Contents.

3. *This way of Reasoning holds as to this
particular Inference, That this one
Priesthood and one Altar ought now,
as well as formerly, to be Principles of
Unity.* I. *The Reasoning from Jew-* *Sect. I.*
ish Precedent to the State of Chri-
stianity holds, tho not as to the same
things, yet to the same in Proportion.
Sect. I, II. 2. *It holds particularly in*
matters of Privilege. Sect. III. 3. *As*
Unity is a Privilege common to the
Mytical and Literal Judaism, so the
Proportional Way of Reasoning holds
also as to the Principles of that Unity.
Sect. IV, V, VI.

4. *The*

Chap. 2.

4. *The Unity intended to be proved by the Christians from this One Priesthood and One Altar was that of an External Visible Communion. Sect. VII.*

5. *This Dispute was not between Individual Altars of the same Communion, but between different Altars, as Notes of different Communions. Sect. VIII.*

6. *Therefore, by the One Priest the Ancients could not mean only Christ, nor by the One Altar only an Invisible Communion with Him. Sect. IX.*

THIRDLY therefore. As this way of Reasoning from *Jewish Precedents* is solid in general, and solid in these very Instances of *Priest* and *Altar*; so it holds particularly in such Inferences as these are, for which they
Sect. I. are produced by the Ancients concerning *Unity*, That as the *One Priest* and the *One Altar* were the Characterisms of *Unity* in the *Jewish* Constitution; so that *Priesthood* and *Altar* among the *Christians*, which was shadowed by the *Jewish Priesthood* and *Altar*, ought now also, by the same parity of Reason, to
 be

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 29

be taken for the Characters of *Christian Chap. 2.*
Unity. For in this way of reasoning
from *Prophetick Resemblances*, tho the
Reasoning do not hold, as it does in o-
ther *Precedents*, that the *Precedents* and
the things *represented* by them must be
of the same kind; Yet 1. There is a Rea-
soning that does hold as solidly as in
the other, and that is particularly in
the *Proportion* between the things
represented by them in the *Prophecy*,
and those which *answer* those Repre-
sentations in the *Antitype*. Thus
the *seven Ears* of Corn and the *seven*
Kine in *Pharaoh's Vision* were indeed Gen. 41.
of different natures from the *seven years* 30, 31.
of *Famine* and *Plenty* that were repre-
sented by them; but yet because the
seven blasted Ears *devoured* the seven
good Ears, and the seven lean Kine
devoured the seven fat ones, he thence
gathers that the seven years of *Famine*
had much *exceeded* the over-plus of the
seven years of *Plenty*, if it had not been
discreetly managed. The like might
have been shewn in the like reasonings
from other *Prophetick Visions*, not only of
the *Scriptures*, but even of the *Heathens*
themselves in their *mystical Oracles*; and,
which were of the same kind, in their
Interpretations

Chap. 2. Interpretations of *Portentous Appearances* (if it had been needful to enlarge on it) that this was the constant and received way of expounding, and reasoning from, these *Symbolical Representations*.

Sect. 2. SUITABLY hereunto, there is as little reason for inferring hence the *Perpetuity of Literal Judaism*, as there is that the seven years of Famine and Plenty must have been *Ears of Corn*, or *Cows*, or that the *Persian and Macedonian Monarchs* in the Vision of *Daniel* must have been *Rams and Goats*. This very way of reasoning it self supposes a difference in *nature* between the *Types and Antitypes*. But yet the *Correspondencies* are still supposed the same. Accordingly as it is supposed in the Reasonings of the *New Testament*, that all matters of *Privilege* that were challenged by the *Literal Jews* did as properly belong to the *spiritual and mystical* ones; so if *Unity with God*, and among *themselves*, be one of these *Privileges*, this must also have been fore-shadowed as belonging to the *Christians*.

Sect. 3. AND Secondly, the *New Testament Reasonings* still suppose all these matters of *Privilege* to belong to the

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 3.1

the *mystical Jews*, that is, the *Christians*, Chap. 2. in a higher and more beneficial sense than to the *Jews* themselves, as far as the *Truth* it self exceeds the most ingenious *Representations*: The *Rest* of *Canaan* was a *Rest* from only forty years fatigue in the *Wilderness*, and from their *Slavery* in *Egypt*, but ours is an *eternal* one, as far exceeding theirs as *Heaven* is beyond *Canaan*, and the *Slavery* of *Sin* and the *Devil* exceeds that of *Pharaoh*. Their *Moses* was only faithful as a *Servant*, our *Fesus* as a *Son*. Their *Messias* was expected as a *Temporal Prince*, ours is also a *Prince of the World* ^{II. 9.} to come. And notwithstanding their boasts of *Justification* by the *Law* of *Moses*, yet by our *Saviour* we are justified ^{Act. 13.3} from things from which we could not be ^{9.} justified by the *Law* of *Moses*. And therefore the *New Covenant* of our *mystical Israelitism* is said to be a *better Covenant*, and established on *better Promises*, by the *Author* to the *Hebrews*. And he proves ^{Heb. 8.6.} it to be so by this very *Argument*, that the *Law* having been only a *shadow* of good things to come, and not the very *Image* of the things themselves, could not make the comers thereunto perfect, plainly supposing that the *Gospel* which does that which the

Chap. 2. the *Law* could not, in making the *comers thereunto perfect*, must therefore give the *originals* of those things of which the *Law* gave only the *Shadows* and *Resemblances*. Thus as the original *Archetypal Ideal Beings* are called the *true Beings* in the Language of the *Platonists*, whose *Notions* are generally alluded to in the *New Testament*; so the *true Beings* are still supposed to perform their Office to more *beneficial* purpose than their *Representations*. The *true Bread* given by *Christ* gives a more solid Nourishment than *Manna*, which was given to the *Patriarchs* in the *Wilderness*. They *died* that were fed with that, but the *Bread* which came down from *Heaven* was such, as that a *man* might eat thereof, and not die, but live for ever. He that drunk of *Jacob's Well* was likely to *thirst* again, but he that drunk of the *Water* which *Christ* was to give him, was *never to thirst* more. And accordingly the *Unity* belonging to the *Mystical Israelitism* of *Christianity* must be so far from falling short of that *Unity* of the *Fews*, as that, in order to the *ends* designed by this *Unity*, it must be more *effectual* and *substantial* than that of the *Fews* themselves.

Whence

S. John 6.
49, 50, 51,
58.

S. John 4.
13, 14.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 33

Whence it will follow, that as the *benefits* are greater which are *gained* by this *Unity*, so the *loss* must also be greater, which is incurred by this *Separation*, and consequently the obligation must be greater to adhere to our *mystical Priests* and *Altars* now, than that was whereby the *Fews* were obliged to adhere to the *Levitical Priest* and *Altar*. I shall not yet compare them, till I have first explained the *Unity* of the *Jewish Church* derived from their *Priest* and *Altar*. Chap. 2.

THIRDLY therefore, as this *Unity* in general is the *common Privilege* of the *Literal* and *mystical Judaism*, but in a more *beneficial* sense proper to the *mystical*; so the Reasoning will especially hold in the *Principles* of it, That as the *Unity* of the *Fews* was derived from their *one Priest* and *one Altar*, so the *Unity* of *Christians* must be derived the same way from what is answerable to the *Priest* and *Altar* among them. For this *Proportion* was the main thing that was argumentative in *Prophetical Resemblances*. As in the instance now mentioned, because the seven *blasted Ears* devoured the seven *good* ones, and the seven *lean Cows* the seven *fair* ones, yet so that neither the *blasted Ears*, nor D the Sect. 4.

Chap. 2. the lean Cows were in appearance better for having devoured the full Ears, and the well-favoured Cows; *Joseph* thence concludes, that the abundance of the Years of Plenty would have made no appearance in the extremity of the Dearth, if the Fruits of the plentiful Years had not been wisely ordered by a provident forecast and frugal management. This being no otherwise revealed to him but by his own Reasoning from *Pharaoh's* Dream, so that *Joseph* himself owns, that it was to *Pharaoh* that God had made the Revelation what himself intended to do in that particular, his whole Reasoning is manifestly grounded on this general Supposition, that the same proportion which was between the blasted and fair Ears, and the lean and fat Cows in the Dreams, should also be between the years of Famine and Plenty in the Event, so that this is plainly supposed as an undoubted Maxim in such kind of Reasonings. *Now* it is plain that this Divination by Dreams, where truly Divine, was one way of Prophecy, and that this Symbolical Theology, (as the supposed *Areopagite* calls it, from the *Platonists*) was the proper way of God's conversing with men; and therefore
here

Gen. 41.
25.

Secl. 5.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 35

here it is as natural and proper to reason Chap. 2.
from *Symbolical Representations*, as it is
to Reason from *Literal Expressions* in
dealing with *Men*. Especially confi-
dering that, in the Case I am speaking
of, these *Symbols* of the *Law* were pur-
posely fitted to represent their *Antitypes*
under the *Gospel*; and so fitted as that
they, who should live in those *later days*,
when those *Prophecies* concerning *mysti-
cal Judaism* were to be fulfilled, might
know their own *Duty*, and within what
Bounds they were to confine their *Inno-
vations* according to the *ancient Pre-
dictions* concerning them, that is, how
far such *Innovations* were agreeable to
the mind of *God* in his *ancient Predicti-
ons*. THUS it is plain that they under-
stood *God*, and thus it is most agree- Sect. 6.
able to his good Providence that he de-
signed to be understood by them, that
they might not be misled in so under-
standing him. But in the Particulars
for which I am concerned at present
there were yet more *particular Presum-
ptions* that this indeed was *God's Design*.
For as it was not to be doubted that *God*
designed *Unity* for the *Mystical*, as well
as the *Literal Israel*, so he would cer-
tainly have been more express in the sig-
nification

Chap. 2. nification of his mind, if he had intended any *change* in the *Principles* of this *Unity*. But seeing there appears not the least *intimation* of such a design, seeing he was pleased to *continue* a *mystical Priesthood*, and a *mystical Altar* in the *Mystical*, as well as the *Literal*, *Israel*. Who would not thence conclude that he intended the *mystical Priesthood* and *Altar* should still be the *Principles* of *Unity* to the *mystical Israel*, as the *Literal Priesthood* and *Altar* had formerly been to the *Literal*? And seeing the very *Terms* of *Priest* and *Altar* were not the proper *Language* of the *New Testament*, why should they be used at all, but only to signify that they were equivalent under the *New Testament* with those things which had properly born their *Names* under the *Old*, and were to perform the same *Office*? Thus it appears that this *way* of *Reasoning* holds particularly in this *Case* concerning *Unity*. I now proceed in my intended *Method*.

Seft. 7. FOURTHLY therefore, it is further certain that this whole *Topick* of *Reasoning*, as it was used by the *Primitive Christians* was plainly designed to characterize a *visible external Communion*,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 37

nion, and a visible external Unity, di Chap. 2.
 stinct from other divided Societies or
 Assemblies of Hereticks and SCHISMA-
 TICS. This is plain in the Disputes of
 Ignatius, which are plainly designed
 against such as baptized or celebrated
 their Agape, or Communion, without
 the Altar of the Bishop, or did any thing
 relating to their Ecclesiastical Assemblies
 without his Authority. And so in all
 the Disputes of S. Cyprian, whether with
 Felicissimus, or the Novatians, these
 Arguments are used against them who
 acted separately from the Bishop, in re-
 ceiving Penitents, or rejecting them, as
 the Novatians, which were Acts of Ec-
 clesiastical Jurisdiction, or in setting up
 Anti-Bishops within a Jurisdiction alrea-
 dy Canonically possessed. And therefore
 their design against such Adversaries as
 these were, must have been to shew that
 the Bishop's Altar, in opposition to those
 Separate Altars, was the one Altar, and
 the Bishop himself that One Priest, which
 were to be the Principles of Catholick
 Unity, in order to the proving all them
 divided, who were not in Communion
 with the Bishop.

Ep ad
 Smyrn.
 Sect. 7.

AND fifthly, this Dispute was not
 between Individual Altars of the same Sect. 8.

D 3 Communion,

Chap. 2. *Communion*, but between different *Altars* as *Notes of different Communions*. *Ignatius*, as he blames them who officiated without the *Bishop's consent*, so he expressly grants the *Validity* of that *Eucharist* which was administred either by the *Bishop*, or by him to whom the *Bishop* permitted it. In vain therefore does Mr. *Mede* gather from hence, that there was then only one *Communion-Table* in the *Bishop's House*. In vain does Mr. *Baxter*, that the *Multitude* of the *Church* consisted in one *Congregation*, which could meet constantly in the same place. This was utterly impertinent to the *Disputes* of those times. They were all of one *Altar*, who were of one *Communion*, from how many *Tables* soever they communicated, and they only belonged to a different *Altar*, and set up *Altar against Altar*, who owned a different *Communion*. This was plainly all which they were obliged to mean by the interest of those *Disputes*.

Sect. 9. AND therefore sixthly, by the *One Priest* those *Ancients* could not mean only *Christ*, nor by the *One Altar*, only an *invisible Communion* with him. This would have been as confidently, and as unconfutably, pretended to by their *Adversaries*,

Ep. ad
Smryn. ib.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. .39

Adversaries, if their own confident Affirmations must have been allowed to pass for Arguments. When therefore they used these Topics as *argumentative* to *Adversaries*, their meaning must have been and was that the means of communicating with *Christ* the *invisible Priest*, was by communicating with him that was *visible*, and the means of partaking of the *invisible Altar*, was also by partaking of that which was *visible*, and consequently that they who were not in *external Communion* with the *Bishop*, could not partake of the *invisible Bread*, nor the *invisible Priesthood*. So *Ignatius* expressly makes disrespect to the (a) *visible Bishop* to redound to the *invisible*, and makes him to be deprived of the (b) *Bread of God* who does not partake of the *Communion* of the *Bishop*. This

(a) Εἰς τιμὴν ὧν ἐκεῖνος τῷ θελήσαντι ἡμᾶς πρέπον ἔστιν ἐπακρῶσαι κατὰ μηδεμίαν ὑπὸ κερμαίν, ἐπεὶ οὐχ' ὅτι τὸ ἐπίσκοπον τῷτον τὸ βλέπομενον πλανᾷ τις, ἀλλὰ ἀόρατον ὡς ἀλογίζεται. τὸ δ' ὅ τοιῶτον, ὃ πρὸς σάρεκα ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ πρὸς θεὸν τὸ τὰ κρυφία εἶδεν. Ep. ad Magn. Sect. 3.

(b) μηδ' εἰς πλανήσθω, ἐὰν μή τις ἢ ἐν ὧς τῷ θεοσκεπείῃ, ὑπερεῖται τῷ ἄρῳ τῷ θεῷ. Ep. ad Ephes. Sect. 5.

Chap. 2. way of reasoning was pertinent to their design, this was actually used by them. Whether consequently to the *Jewish* Notions alluded to, will best appear when we have first explained what those *Notions* were. If it were so, it will then appear, from the Principles already laid down, that it must have been cogent and solid.

C H A P. III.

How far the Jews were confined to the Use of One Altar. Application to Mr. Baxter.

The Contents.

The Jews expressly confined to One Altar, which Josephus understands as a Preservative of Unity. Sect. I. But 1. This One Altar was only for Publick Assemblies of the whole Nation. Sect. II. 2. This did not hinder other Places for Religious Assemblies. Sect. III. 3. This did not hinder Altars of

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 41

of Memorial in other Places. Sect. IV. Chap. 3.

4. This did not altogether make the Use of other Places and Altars Unlawful, even for Sacrifices. Prophets might, and did ordinarily use them.

Sect. V. They seem to have been allowed for their Ordinary Sacrifices which did not require Assemblies of their whole Nation. Sect. VI. VII.

I PROCEED therefore to shew Sect. I.

the Jewish Notions concerning this Matter, I mean those which were received among them in the first beginnings of Christianity. And the first thing of these that was insisted on, was the *Unity* of their *Altar*. In their first establishment by *Moses* they were confined to one place for the offering of all their *Publick Sacrifices*, Deut. 12. 11, 12, 13, 14. This *Josephus*, by whom we may judge of the sense of the *Jews* of that age, understands thus: 'Εν ἐτέ-

ρα ὃ πόλει, μήτε βωμὸς, μήτε νεὼς ἔστω. Ant. L. IV.
 δεὸς γὰρ ἓς, καὶ τὸ ἑσθλὸν γένος ἐν. c. ult. p.
 121. C.

He plainly understands it as a prohibition of other *Altars*, and that for this very Reason of *Unity*. One reason indeed is the *Unity* of their *God*, which does

Chap. 3. does not take away the *Use*, but only the *Obligation* of using several Altars. The *same God* was oftentimes worshiped in *several Nations*, and *several places*, and under *several Denominations*, and on account of *several Virtues*, with *several Altars*. But where the *Deities* were *different*, there they were *not* to be worshiped at the *same Altars*, unless it were for some peculiar reason agreed on by their *Divines*, as in the Cases of the *Pantheon*, of the *twelve Gods*, the *Dioscuri*, *Pluto* and *Proserpine*, and the *Cabiri*, &c. And this was a thing which they, who were newly come out of *Ægypt*, had need to be particularly warned of, where every *Nomos* had a *distinct Deity*, and those things were *deified* in some places which were *abhorred* in others, which accordingly kept them in perpetual rancors and animosities against one another. And the *Polytheism*, they were in danger of from their Idolatrous Neighbours, included *multitudes* of *Gods*, not only for *Hills*, (a) but for *Valleys*; not only for *Nations*, but (b) *Cities*; not only for *Cities*, but (c) *Streets*, &c. And therefore even this Reason of their having only *one God* common to their whole

vide Fal-
coner de
Num.
Apamns.

Vide Ju-
venal. Sat.

(a) 1 King.

20. 23. 28.

(b) Jer. 2.

28.

If. 36. 18.

19.

(c) Ezek.

16. 24. 31.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 43

whole Nation would not only prevent all necessary Obligation to multiply Altars to him, but make it prudent to forbid them, lest their very multiplying Altars to their *one God* should look like an acknowledgment of *many Gods* in their Practice, at least, might give too plausible a pretence to them who were otherwise of themselves so very inclinable, as we see they were, to *Polytheism*. Chap. 3.

THE other Reason is, because the *Hebrews* themselves were but *one Nation*, plainly supposing that the participation at several Altars had made and signified their being distinct Nations in extraction. Before I come to shew how this *One Altar* was a Constitutive of *Unity*, I shall first consider in what sense the Altar it self was only *One*, and to what extent it did unite. Therefore this Altar was indeed for Assemblies. There was but *one publick Altar* in the whole Nation, before which all the *clean Males* were to assemble thrice every year. But these Assemblies Mr. B. I suppose himself will grant to exceed the care of any single Priest. How then can he barely from the name of *one Altar* infer that the *Christian Assemblies* united by it were no greater than such as could ordinarily communicate Sect. 2.

Chap. 3. communicate at the *same Table*, and partake of the *personal Ministry* of the *same Priest*? Was it not much easier for great *Multitudes* to receive inconsiderable pieces of *Bread* from the *same Table* than it was for them to make a solemn *Feast* on *Sacrificed Beasts* from the *same Altar*?

Seet. 3. 2. THIS *One Altar* at *Shiloh* or *Ferusalem* did not hinder their *Assembling* within their *own Tribes*, and their *Assembling* for *Religion*, and their having *stated places* appointed for such *Assemblies* elsewhere besides *Ferusalem*. They had their *Synagogues* and *Proseucha*, and *Houses of God*, as they called them, in *Multitudes*, and in *several places* of the *Land*, for exercise of the *Morals* of their *Religion*, for *hearing the Law* and *Prophets read* and *explained* to them, and for *Prayer*, and for solemnizing their *Ordinary Festivals* of their *New Moons* and *Sabbaths*. If Mr. B. will call them *Chappels of Ease* because they were not permitted in them the use of their more *publick Sacrifices*, they will then more exactly answer our *Diocesan Parishes*. However this will plainly shew that to be true which he thinks so *strange*, that the *same multitudes* which were united
in

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 45

in the *Diocesan Altar*, might notwithstanding be subdivided into *several Congregations* under *particular Priests*, for their more convenient management, tho such *private Priests* had not been allowed the power of *Altar Discipline* any where but in the *presence* of their *Bishop*. Chap. 3.

3. THIS *One Altar* at *Ferusalem* did Sect. 4.
not hinder *Altars* of *Memorial* in other places. There was an *Altar* to be built at *Mount Ebal* by *Moses's* express Command, *Deut.* 27. 4, 5. with the Law of *Deuteronomy* inscribed on it. And when it was known that the *Altar* of the Tribes beyond *Fordan* was not designed for *Sacrifices*, but only for a *Memorial* of their Relation to their Brethren in *Palestine*, no further offence was taken at it. *Jos.* XXII. 23, 26, 27, 28, 29. This was indeed one of the most ancient designs of *Altars*, that when any one had received any singular favour from God, he erected an *Altar* with an *Inscription* in the place where he had received it, as a remaining Monument of the Favour so received, and the shape of an *Altar* was best fitted for receiving such *Inscriptions*. Tho therefore it should be proved, as it cannot, that the *Eucharist* was Jos. 8. 31. 32.

Chap. 3. was celebrated only at the *Bishops Altar*. Yet in the subdistinguished Charges there might have been *Monuments* of their Relation to the common *Altar* of the *Bishop*.

Sect. 5. NOR 4. did this *One Altar* in the publick place of their *Anniversary Assemblies* make it utterly unlawful, even to offer *Sacrifices* in other places, and on other *Altars*: *Holocausts* and *Peace-Offerings* were, by *Moses's* expresse command, to be offered at the fore-mentioned place of *Mount Ebal*. Nor do the *Fews* deny but *Prophets* might, and did erect *Altars*, and offer *Sacrifices* in other places besides that of the general *Assemblies*. So *Samuel* sacrificed at *Mizpah*, 1 *Sam.* VII. 9. and in *Zuph*, IX. 5. and in *Gilgal*, XI. 15, where he had also sacrificed the second time, if *Saul* had not prevented him, XIII. 8, 9. and at *Bethlehem*, XVI. 5. And after the strictest confinement of the publick *Worship*, when the *Temple* was built, yet even then *Elijah* sacrifices at *Mount Carmel*, 1 *Kings* XVIII. 19, &c. I know the modern *Fews* pretend that *Prophets* had a *Privilege* of breaking positive *Commands* of this kind, and instance particularly in this of *Elijah*. No doubt they

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 47

they might in some things for which *Chap. 3.*
they pretended particular *extraordinary*
Inspiration. But this we find they did
frequently as they had occasion, without
the least scruple. And as *Prophets* in
those times, when they had their *ordi-*
nary Schools and Colleges, were not to be
looked on as *extraordinary Officers*, so
neither are they to be supposed to have
acted *extraordinarily* in what they did
easily and frequently. Besides the *Dissol-*
ution of their *Union* was in truth a thing
of greater consequence than the belief
of any particular persons pretences to
Inspiration. As therefore the *Prophet*
himself would for that reason alone
have been judged a *false Prophet*, if he
had endeavoured to perswade them to a
Departure from their *Law*, so there is little
reason to doubt but that he would have
been thought so too, if he had endea-
voured a *Dissolution* of their *Unity*.

BUT to let the Case of these *Pro-* *Seet. 6.*
phets pass, it is certain that, besides
their three great Festivals wherein all the
clean Males were to appear personally at
Jerusalem, there were also other Sacri-
fices appointed by the Law of God,
wherein the *Publick* were also concern-
ed. Such were those of the *daily Sacri-*
fices,

Chap. 3. *fices*, of the *Sabbaths*, and of the *New*
 Num. 28. *Moons*. Must we therefore think that
 they who were at a distance from *Ferusalem* thought themselves unconcerned
 in those *Sacrifices*? It is no way proba-
 ble that they did so. That question of
 the *Shunamite's* Husband, (what she had
 2 King. 4. to do with the *Prophet*, seeing it was
 24. *neither New Moon, nor Sabbath?*) plainly
 implies, that on such occasions it was
 customary for devout persons to attend
 the *Prophets*. And what could it be for,
 if not to partake of their *Sacrifices*?
 Their *private Devotions* required not
 the presence of any such person. The
Reading of the *Law* and the *Prophets*
 seems not to have been any part of the
Synagogue-Worship, till after the *Capti-*
vity. If it had, it is hardly imaginable
 how the *Pentateuch* would have so mis-
 carried as it did from the time of *Manas-*
seh to *Josiah*. How successful soever
Manasseh might have been in suppressing
 it in his own Dominions, yet he could
 not do it in *Samaria*. The Instances al-
 ready produced, shew that the *Prophets*
 did ordinarily *sacrifice*, and yet I believe
 one instance cannot be produced that
 ever they did so in *Ferusalem*. Besides,
 for the *New Moons*, it was *David's* ex-
 cuse

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 49

cuse to *Saul* for his absence, that he was invited to a *publick Sacrifice* for his whole *Family* in *Bethlehem*, 1 Sam. XX. 5, 6, 29. It seems then it was usual for *Families* to have their *proper Sacrifices* in their own *Cities*, and that the *New Moons* which were otherwise appointed by *God*, were particularly pitched on for that purpose. This was also usual among the *Heathens*. The Story is famous of *Fabius Dorsuo*, who, while the *Galls* besieged the *Capitol*, ventured through them in his *Cinctus Gabinus*, to perform these Solemnities of his *Family* in the *Collis Quirinalis*, and was suffered by those *Barbarians* to return to the *Capitol* without any violence offered to him. IT is very well known that, for a long time together, *Sacrifices* were offered in the *high places* by persons otherwise creditable, and of good Authority; without the least reproof, whilst they kept their due subordination to the places of their *general Assemblies*. And considering that all the *Flesh* to be eaten by them was to be *sacrificed*, as a Learned Person has very well observed, and that it was allowed them to eat *Flesh* in their *other Cities*; it plainly follows that they must have been allowed

Chap. 3.

Liv. Lib. V.
Valer. Max.
vid. Gutheri
de Jur.
Pont. III.
17. IV. 6.

Sect. 7.

Dr. Cudworth True
Not. of
the Lord's
Supper.

Chap. 3. to sacrifice them there also. And when ever we find the permission of these *Sacrifices* in the *high places* reprehended as an imperfection in the good Kings; yet it is never reprehended so severely as to deprive them of a good Character, who were guilty of no higher crimes than this permission. And therefore certainly this offering of those *Sacrifices* in other places which were not proper for the *three Solemnities*, but agreeable to those *times* wherein they were not obliged to be *Personally* present in *Jerusalem*, was never taken for a crime of that nature as to cut them off from their *Union* with the *People of God*. If so, then, by this way of Reasoning, there might also have been *many Altars*, under the *one Altar* of the *Bishop* without any danger to that *Catholick Unity* which was derived from the *One Altar*.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 51

Chap. 4.

CHAP. IV.

Independence of any other Altar on their National Altar was by the Jews condemned as inconsistent with their Unity. Proved from Instances of Altars so condemned.

The CONTENTS.

The only thing which the Jews thought inconsistent with their Unity, as derived from One Altar, was the erecting an Altar owning no dependence on the National Altar, or Rivalling it in its Prerogatives as a National one. Sect. I. Enquiry into the Particulars so condemned. That of the Tribes beyond Jordan. Jos. XXII. Sect. II. III. IV. Those of Jeroboam. Sect. V. VI. VII.

WHAT is it then that was Sect. I. thought inconsistent, among the *Jews*, with their *Unity* as derived from *one Altar*? I cannot find that any other Altar was thought to be so but such

Chap. 4. a one as *rivalled* the *Altar* in the place of their *publick Assemblies*, that is, that owned no *dependence* on it, that challenged the peculiar *Prerogatives* of that *Altar*, their three *Anniversary Assemblies*, their *first Fruits*, and *first born*, their *Tithes* and *Vows*, and *Sacrifices* on such occasions as were thus appropriated to such a particular place, on account of its being the place appointed by God himself for his *One Altar*, whatsoever *Altar* did rival that *one Altar* in *these things*, that was indeed reputed an *Altar against that Altar*, that cut them off from their *dependence* on that *one Altar*, and did so far *disunite* them from continuing to be *one People*.

Sect. 2. T H A T this was so I shall first shew by a summary view of the matters of *Fact* that were condemned on this account, and then shew the *Reasons* why they condemned those *Facts* from the *Principles* of that Age. The first *Fact* that was condemned on this account was the *Altar* of the *Reubenites* and *Gadites* and the half Tribe of *Manasseh*, immediately upon their dismission by *Josbua*. This we see was looked on as a Crime of a very high nature, and as a great affront to their received

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 53

ceived Religion, that the other Tribes *Chap. 4*
thought themselves obliged on a Religious Account, to punish it by a War. And the best means to know what it was that was thus severely blamed in it, will be to see how it was charged, and how it was defended. It was charged with a design of *rebelling* against the Lord, Verse 16. It is charged with a *departure from the Lord*, and from the Fellowship of their Brethren. So the vulgar Latine: *Tantum ut a Domino, & à nostro consortio, non recedatis adificato altari prater altare Domini Dei nostri.* Verse 19. Here it is plainly charged with a *dissolution of Unity*, and that both of their *Unity with God*, and with his *People*. This therefore was the Crime from which those other Tribes were concerned to purge themselves. And how do they do it? They deny that their *Altar* was intended for *Burnt Offering* or *Sacrifice*. Verse 26. And how far that *Reason* went for their Purgation, and of what *Sacrifices* they principally designed it, may better be gathered from their following Words, Verse 27, *But it shall be a witness between us and you, and between our generations after us, to execute the service of the*

Chap. 4. *Lord before him in our burnt offerings, and in our Sacrifices, and in our Peace-offerings, and that your children should not say to our children in time to come, ye have no part in the Lord, 28. Therefore said we, if so be that they should so say to us, or to our generations in time to come, then will we Answer, Behold the fashion of the Altar of the Lord, which our Fathers made, not for burnt offering, nor for Sacrifice, but it is a witness between us and you. And they conclude in detestation of the Charge: Verse 29. God forbid that we should rebel against the Lord, and turn this day from the Lord, to build an Altar for burnt offering, or for meat offering, or for sacrifice, save the Altar of the Lord our God that is before his Tabernacle.*

Sect. 3. *THEIR Reasoning is plainly this. They disown any design of drawing their Posterity from the Assemblies and Sacrifices before the Ark, which was then in Shiloh. They profess that this was so far from their design as that their meaning was only to assert their Right to that common Altar of the Jewish Nation, that in time to come they might not be excluded from their Sacrifices. That plainly was the meaning of those words, ye have no part in the part in the Lord,*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 55

Lord, to deny their *Right* of partaking *Chap. 4.*
in their *common Sacrifices*. And of what
Sacrifices could these be understood but
of those which were offered in the por-
tions of the *other Tribes*, from whence
it might otherwise have been in their
power to exclude them? This they as-
serted by preserving among themselves
a *Copy* of the *Altar* which was before
the *Tabernacle*. So it appears that the
Altars of *different Deities* were of *differ-*
ent Shapes, and that by owning the *shape*
of the *Altar* of the *God* of *Israel* they
signified that *he* was the *God* to whom
their *Devotions* were designed, and
with whom they pretended to *communi-*
cate in their *Sacrifices*. And herein con-
sisted the difficulty of *doubling* their
Altar in the *Oracle* given to the *Delians*.
If they had not been confined to the *same*
shape, they need not have consulted *Pla-*
to concerning it. So when *Moses* was
to make his *Altar*, as well as the rest of
the *Utenfils* of the *Tabernacle*, it seems
plainly to imply, in that way of *mystical*
Reasoning which was designed, that by
his *Altar* they might expect to partake
of the invisible *Ideal Altar*, and conse-
quently of *Communion* with *God* himself.
And this I take to be the sin of *Abaz*, in

Theon.
Smyrn.
Matth. Pla-
ton. c. 1.

Philo de
Temulent.
p. 260.

Chap. 4. taking a Copy of the *Altar* at *Damascus*,
2 Kings XVI. 10, 11, &c. That in Copy-
 ing the *Altar* he professed an approba-
 tion and *Communion* with those *Syrian*
Idolaters. This therefore was the way
 taken by *Onias* in his *Temple* at *Heliopolis*.
 That he might avoid the imputation of
SCHISM he Copied his *Altar* from
 the *Altar* at *Ferusalem*, as we shall ob-
 serve hereafter. This Copy therefore of
 the *Altar* at *Shiloh* signified their chal-
 lenging a *Right* in those *Assemblies* and
Sacrifices which were *there* to be observ-
 ed. Nay, to take of all pretence of
 being hindered by this new *Altar* from
 the participating in the *Assemblies* and
Sacrifices of *Shiloh*, they profess further
 that they intended it for no *Sacrifices* at
 all, not even those that were offered *day-*
ly, nor on their *Sabbaths*, or *New Moons*.
 So far they were from pretending it for
 those *Anniversary* Ones which required
 their Attendance at *Shiloh*. In all which
 Apologies they plainly suppose that *this*
Use of their *Altar* that had broken them
 off from their attendance on the *Altar*
 and *Tabernacle* of *Shiloh*, had indeed
 been the Case that had made them justly
 obnoxious to the charge, of having an *Al-*
zare prater Altare, of having an *Altar*
save

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 57

*save the Altar of the Lord their God that Chap. 4.
was before the Tabernacle, and of dividing
from God and from the Communion of
their Brethren.*

THAT this was the true state of *Sept. 4.*
that Controversie seems also very proba-
ble from the *reason* intimated by the
other Tribes whereby they were
brought into this suspicion. *Notwith-*
standing, if the land of your possession be *verse 19.*
unclean, then pass ye over unto the land of
the possession of the Lord, wherein the
Lord's Tabernacle dwelleth, and take pos-
session among us: but rebel not, &c. The
reason as it should seem that made the
Ten Tribes suspect that their Brethren
intended this *Altar* for the *publick Sacri-*
fices and *Assemblies* on their side *Jordan*
was, that they took the land of their
own possession to be *unclean*, and that
their design in erecting this *new Altar*
was to *cleanse* it. In this supposition,
they offer them a better expedient as
they conceived, that they should rather
come over to their own Land, which
they call the *Possession of the Lord*, as
acknowledged *clean* on both sides, than
take that undue way of *sanctifying* what
they injoyed already on the other side of
Jordan. But *private Altars* were not
thought

Chap. 4. thought sufficient to *sanctifie* the *Land*. If so, that same *Land* of *Canaan* had been holy long before it was conquered by *Joshua*; for *Abraham* and the other *Patriarchs* had *sacrificed* there whilst it was yet possessed by the *Canaanites*. The *Wilderness* had also been *holy*, where *Moses* *sacrificed* after the *Victory* over *Amalek*. It was therefore a *publick Altar* alone erected by the present *possessors* of the *Land* that could properly be said to *sanctifie* it, and for such a one they took that of which I am at present discoursing. It was erected by the whole *Body* of the *Possessors* of those parts before they dispersed themselves, immediately after their return from helping their *Brethren* in *Canaan*; not by any one *single Tribe*, much less for the *Rites* of a *single Family*. It was also greater than ordinary. So the *Text* notes that it was a *great Altar* to see to: Verse 10. From thence they might conjecture that it was designed for the *extraordinary Sacrifices* of their *Anniversary Assemblies*, to excuse them from their *Anniversary Attendance*. This very *Story* plainly shews that they were already *disunited* in their *secular Government*. If they had also been made thus independent

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 59

independent in *Religion* also, this had *Chap. 4.*
indeed so disunited them, as that
they would not any longer have looked
like *one Nation*.

THE next instances of *Altars* erected *Sect. 5.*
against the *publick Altar* were those of
Feroboam against the *Altar of Ferusalem*.
These were plainly designed to cut off
the ten Tribes of his own Kingdom from
their correspondence with *Ferusalem*.
The reason inducing him to it was, lest,
by their frequent Journeys thither on oc-
casion of the three *Anniversaries*, they
should contract a dangerous correspon-
dence and friendship with the Kings of
the Lineage of *David*, in whose Domi-
nions the *publick Altar* was, and, for a
love of their Religion, and to make
their Journey more easie, they should
be tempted to revolt from him to their
former Master. *1 Kings XII. 27.* This
appears also from the *reason* pretended
by him, why he did so, to the People,
Verse 28. It is too much for you to go up
to Ferusalem: behold thy Gods, O Israel,
which brought thee up out of the Land of
Egypt. It was plainly to discourage
them from going up to *Ferusalem* that he
made use of this pretence of the trouble-
someness of their *Fourneys*, so far, and
so

Chap. 4. so frequently. And accordingly he fits his pretended Expedients. To ease them of the *length* of their Journies, he appoints them *two places* instead of that *one*, and both of them in the opposite Frontiers of his own Kingdom, *Dan* in the *Northern*, and *Bethel* in the *Southern* Parts, that so none might have occasion to go *out* of his Kingdom, on account of their Worship in their *Anniversary Assemblies*, nor yet be obliged to so long Journies *within* it as formerly. The distance was less to *two* places, I mean to the choice of either of them, than it would have been to any *one*, and yet more convenient in the *Borders* than in any other situation. By that means it came to pass that none of them could come at *Jerusalem*, but he must pass by one of them at a more convenient distance from his own abode. And for avoiding the same pretended trouble of the *Anniversaries*, he reduces the *three* to only *one*, like unto the Feast that was in *Judah*, which makes me more inclinable to think that it ought not to be understood of the *eighth Month*, as our present Copies have it, but of the *seventh*, Verse 32, 33. and particularly of the Feast of *Tabernacles*. So *Josephus* read
and

Ant. VIII.
3. Gr. 8.
Lat.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 61

and understood in the Copies of his time. Chap. 4.

Why should he cut off *two* of their *Anniversaries*, and yet pitch so punctually on the *third* of them for the time of his own *Assemblies*, if his design had not been, as I said, particularly to cut off their dependence on *Jerusalem* in this very particular point of their *Anniversary Sacrifices* and *Assemblies*? These were his Innovations concerning the *Altar*. As to the *Priesthood*, he changed that also from the Family of *Aaron*, and the Tribe of *Levi*, and the Rules of the *Law*, by that means making them also independent on the *High-Priesthood* of *Hierusalem*.

BY this explication of his Case it Sect. 6.
will be easie also to understand the Reasoning of *Abijah* against him. I meddle not with those particulars of his Discourse wherein he charges him with *Idolatry*, but those wherein he charges him with these Innovations also concerning the *Law*. He plainly challenges the Privileges of the *Segullah* to his own Kingdom, the *Metropolis* whereof was *Jerusalem*. Accordingly he tells them that *God* was on *their* side for their Captain, and that fighting against his own Party was fighting against the *Lord God*

Chap. 4. God of their Fathers. And behold God himself is with us for our Captain, and his
2 Chron. XIII. 12. Priests with sounding Trumpets, to cry allarm against you: O Children of Israel, fight ye not against the Lord God of your Fathers, for ye shall not prosper. And in this reasoning he concludes this peculiar presence of God which was proper to the *Segullab* from the presence of his Priests, and the Orderlyness of their Ministrati-
 on. So he reasons, Verse 10. As for us, the Lord is our God, and we have not forsaken him, and the Priests which minister unto the Lord are the Sons of Aaron, and the Levites wait upon their business.
 V. 11. And they burn unto the Lord, &c. for we keep the charge of the Lord our God, but ye have forsaken him. And this charge against *Feroboam* of having forsaken God he manages also on the same Principles, Verse 9, Have ye not cast out the Priests of the Lord, the Sons of Aaron, and the Levites, &c. So that in this way of Reasoning, keeping united with the Priesthood, is the same with not having forsaken God, and disuniting from them is the same with having forsaken him; and they who keep thus united can call the Lord their own God, but they who had thus forsaken him could not call him so.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 63

so. He is only said to be the *God* of *Chap. 4.* their *Fathers*. This touches the very point of the *Segullah*, their being *God's* peculiar *People*, and *God's* being peculiarly their *God* rather than of any other *People*. If therefore this *Privilege* was forfeited by their discession from *God's* *Priesthood*, by their being *disunited* from *God* himself in such a sense as this; it plainly follows that this *Priesthood* must have been taken for a Bond of their *Union* with *God*, and each other, as they were a *Sacred Society*, and intitled to *Sacred Privileges*.

THE like account of this *design* of *Sect. 7.* *Feroboam* is given by the Author of the *Greek Book* of *Tobit*, tho much obscured by the *Latin*, I know not whether I should call him, *Paraphrast*, or *Epitomator*. Either name will better agree to him than that of a *Translator*. He calls the sin of the ten Tribes of *Feroboam's* Kingdom an *Apostasie*, πᾶσα φυλὴ τῆς νεφθαλὶ τῆς πατρὸς μὲς ἈΠΕΣΤΗ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου ἱεροσολύμων, &c. *Chap. i* V. 4. And again, πᾶσα αἱ φυλαὶ αἱ ΣΥΝΑΠΟΣΤΑΣΑΙ ἔθνον τῇ βαβυλ, &c. *Verse 5.* *Apostasie* from the *House* of *Jerusalem* plainly implies a *duty* of *subjection* to that *House*. The true notion of the Word
is

Chap. 4. is to signifie a *revolting*. And wherein that *revolting* consisted appears by what *Tobit* himself is said to have done, which was not done by the *Revolters*.
 Καὶ ΜΟΝΟΣ ἐπεβόρυν πλεονάκης εἰς ἱερὸσόλυμα ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς, καὶ δὲς γέγραπται πῶς τὰ ἱερὰ, ἐν περὶ ματι αἰωνίῳ, τοῖς ἀπαρχαῖς, καὶ τοῖς δεκάταις καὶ θνημάτων, καὶ τὰς πρωτοουσίας ἔχων, Verse 6. The Privileges therefore of the *Temple* consisted in the obligation that lay on the *whole Nation* to come thither on the *Solemn Festivals*, and to bring thither their *First-fruits*, and *Tithes*, and the *First Fleeces* of their Sheep. These were the *πρωτοουσίαι*. These things he had been taught by his Grandmother *Deborah*, Verse 7. and accordingly he reckons them as *Apostates*, who did not joyn with him in such performances. This account we have from one of the most ancient *Hellenists* now extant. In this *SCHISM* of *Fero-boam* here were *Altars* erected against the *One Altar* in *Ferusalem*, and a *Priesthood* independent on the *Priesthood* in *Ferusalem*; but as yet no mention of the *One Priest* requisite as a *Constitutive* of *Unity* as well as of the *One Altar*.

C H A P. V.

Concerning the Samaritan Temple and Altar and Priesthood, together with other Temples and Altars.

The CONTENTS.

The Unity of the Priesthood first insisted on by the Jews in their Disputes against the Samaritans. Sect. I. Our Saviour himself declared himself against the Samaritans. Sect. II, III. This Case of the Samaritans happening after the Old-Testament Scriptures, is, for that Reason, more applicable to the Times of the Gospel. Sect. IV. The Samaritans not excluded from the Name and Privileges of true Israelites, on account of the falshood of their pretences to Israelitish Extraction. Sect. V. The true ground of those false Pretences. Sect. VI. Nor on account of their Idolatry. Sect. VII, VIII. The true State of that Controversie explained from the Words of the Woman of Samaria. Sect. IX. The History of the

F

Occasion

Chap. 5.

Occasion of *that* Difference. Sect. X. XI. *The Right of the One Priesthood referred, on both sides, to be decided by Succession.* Sect. XII. *The Altar of Ahaz.* Sect. XIII. *The Altar and Temple of Onias in Heliopolis.* Sect. XIV. *Not SCHISMATICALLY designed by him.* Sect. XV. XVI. *Nor did it prove SCHISMATICAL in the Event.* Sect. XVII. *No SCHISMATICAL Succession to the High Priesthood kept up there.* Sect. XVIII. *How far this instance went to the justifying the Primitive Christians in reference to the Jews.* Sect. XIX. *The other Jewish Temples mentioned by Onias Idolatrous.* Sect. XX. XXI. XXII.

Sect. I. **T**HE first mention I think of *One Priest*, as well as of *One Altar*, in the Disputes concerning SCHISM, among the *Jews*, was I think, in that famous one of the *Samaritans*. This was indeed freshest in the memories of the first Converts from *Judaism* to *Christianity*, and therefore most probable to have been regarded in the use of these *Reasonings* that were derived from *Jewish*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 67

ist *Notions.* Tho the *Temple* of the *Chap. 5.*
Samaritans was destroyed by *Hyrcaus*
 within about two hundred years after it
 was first built, and with it, no doubt,
 their *Altar*, and the *Succession* of their
Anti-Priests, which would by no means
 be permitted them after they were Sub-
 jects to the *Fews*; yet the *animosities*
 continue to this very day, and were par-
 ticularly extremely *high* at the beginning
 of *Christianity*. That the *Samaritans*
 had no *Dealings* with the *Fews* appears
 from the words of the *Woman* of *Sama-*
ria, and she mentions it on occasion of a
 very small request indeed of our *Saviour*
 from her, only that of a draught of cold
Water. And another time our *Saviour*
 could get no *Lodging* in a *Village* of the
Samaritan Jurisdiction, for no other
 provocation but that they thought him
 travelling towards *Ferusalem*. And when
 the *Fews* tell our *Saviour* that he was a
Samaritan, and had a *Devil*, we see
 they used it as a name of the greatest
 reproach with the vulgar.

Josep. Anti

S. Joh. IV.

Luke IX.
 52, 53.

ACCORDINGLY our *Saviour* *Sect. 2.*
 and the *Apostles* had occasion to declare
 themselves what they thought concern-
 ing these Disputes, and they still declare
 themselves in favour of their own Coun-

Chap. 5. try-men. Our Saviour himself, in his
 Dispute with the *Woman of Samaria*,
 s Joh. IV. tells her that *Salvation* was of the *Fews*.
 22. The *Salvation* there spoken of was in
 all likelyhood that which was expected
 from the *Messias*, who was to be a *Prince*
 (a) and a *Saviour*, and was therefore
 31. called (b) *Emanuel*, *God with us*, be-
 (b) Mat. I. cause he was to *save his People from*
 21, 23. *their Sins*. When therefore he appro-
 priates this *Salvation* to the *Fews*, his
 meaning was most probably this, that
 whereas the *Samaritans* as well as the
Fews, did pretend to the *privilege* of be-
 ing *God's only People*, God himself
 would declare it against them. The
Messias who was promised to the *true*
Israel of God, should not come of the
Samaritans, but of the *Fews*, who
 should also alone be partakers of that
Salvation of which he was to be Author
 as *Messias* to a *particular People*. That the
Messias, who was to be of the Stock of
God's Israel, was to be a *Few* by ex-
 traction, plainly confuted the *Samaritan*
 pretence of *themselves* being alone the
true Israel, exclusively to the *Fews*.
 That the benefit of his *Salvation*, which
 was at first appropriated to the *Israelites*
 till they were cast off from being the
 Segullah

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 69

Segullah by God himself, should be also Chap. 5.
proper to the *Jews*, understood in contra-
distinction to the *Samaritans*, plainly
implies that the *Samaritans* were to be
excluded out of the number of his *People*
which were to be saved by the *Messias*.
What is this but plainly to deny any in-
terest they could challenge in any rela-
tion to the *Segullah*, of being either the
People of God, exclusively to others, or
being any *part* of his *People*, whilst they
continued in their own Faction?

SO also upon other occasions, he Sect. 3.
ranks the *Samaritans* with those who
were no *part* of the *People of God*.
When the ten Lepers were cleansed,
none returned to give him thanks but one
of them who was a *Samaritan*. Thereupon
our *Saviour* himself makes this Observa-
tion: *Were there not ten cleansed? But* Lu. XVII.
where are the nine? There are not found 17, 18.
that returned to give Glory to God, save
this Stranger. The word is not ξένος
only, but ἀμοϋνός, one of another
People, and Extraction, one that was a
Stranger to the *Covenant of Promise*, as
the Apostle expresses it on another occa-
sion, in the Language of the *Jews* con-
cerning all who were not of the *Segullah*.
And therein indeed consists the aggrava-

Chap. 5. tion of the ingratitude of those who did not return, that a person who was not of the *People* of the *God* of *Israel*, and who could not call that *God* his in so peculiar a regard as *they* could, should notwithstanding be more *thankful* for a benefit received from *him* than they who were already of his *People*. So in his Parable of him who fell among Thieves, the *Priest* and *Levite* pass him by, only the *Samaritan* takes pity on him. By the *Priest* and *Levite* he personates those from whom that benefit might be expected on account of their common *Relation*, as Fellow *Members* of *God's People*, by the *Samaritan*, one from whom, on that account, it could least be expected, so that still the *Samaritan* is represented as one who had the least relation to *God's People*. Again when he sent out the Twelve *Apostles*, among the rest of his Charges to them this is one. *Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any City of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost Sheep of the house of Israel*. Plainly he distinguishes the *Samaritans* as well as the *Gentiles*, from the *House of Israel*, and distinguishes them in this very instance, which was the *Privilege* of the *Jews*, to have the Gospel

S. Luke X.
30, 31, 32,
33, &c.

Matt. X. 5.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 71

Gospel first Preached to them. On this *Chap. 5.* account it was that they are called the *Children of the Kingdom*. Thence those words of S. Paul and Barnabas : *It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing you put it from you, and judge your selves unworthy of everlasting life, lo we turn to the Gentiles.* Thence the same Apostle elsewhere derives the calling of the *Gentiles* from their blindness and hard heartedness as a fulfilling of that Prophecy, that therefore God would provoke them to jealousy by them that were no People, &c. which he understands of the *Gentiles*. Therefore he makes the fall of them to be the riches of the World, and the diminishing of them the riches of the *Gentiles*, and the casting away of them the reconciling of the world, because it was upon their rejecting of the Gospel that God first gave way to the sending the Gospel to the *Gentiles*. By all which it appears that till they had first rejected it, the Gospel it self was reckoned among the Properties of the *Segullah*. And therefore it being even then forbidden to the *Samaritans*; it thence follows, that even then the *Samaritans* were not included in the peculiar People of God.

AR. XIII.

Rom. X.
19. XI. 11.

Rom. XI.
12, 15.

Chap. 5. I HAVE been the rather more particular in the proof of this because this
 Sect. 4. Case of the *SCHISM* of the *Samaritans* fell out after the *Historical Books* of the *Old Testament*. Tho it did so, and tho the *Judgment* of the *Jews* otherwise might have been *fallible* after the ceasing of the *Spirit of Prophecy*; yet that in this Case they were free from any *actual mistake* appears plainly by this *approbation* afterwards by them who introduced that *Spirit* again after it had failed for a *time*. And in this regard, their *Reasonings* in this matter will be so far from suffering any disadvantage because they were not first applyed in that former time of that *Spirit of Prophecy*, as that, for that very reason, they will be *more Argumentative* under the *Gospel*. Had they been applyed in those *inspired times*, they might have been suspected to have something of the *Positive Divine Institution* in them which was particularly *proper* to those *times*, and therefore still to be passed over in *Reasoning* to the *times* of the *Gospel*. But being first applyed in *times* only of *Eccllesiastical Prudence*; they must therefore have been drawn from that *Analogy* and *Proportion* only, which, as I said,
 is

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 73

is the only proper way of *Reasoning* Chap. 5. from *Old Testament* Precedents to the state of the *Gospel*. Only in this particular Instance we have this peculiar advantage above what we have in other Reasonings, even of the same kind, that whereas this way of *Reasoning* from the proportion of things *then* to what ought to be *now*, is of it self very liable to mistakes, according to the skill, or Prudence, or Sagacity, of him who used it; we are yet assured that there was no actual mistake here, from this later approbation of *infallible* Persons.

THIS therefore being thus premised, *Seet. 5.* That the *Samaritans* were actually no part of *God's People*, and that accordingly the *Reasonings* on which the *Jews* proceeded in their particular Case were actually solid and convincing; it will now be seasonable to proceed to an Explication of their Case, what it was, and on what account it was so censured. But I shall first prevent some mistakes which might otherwise misrepresent it.

1. Therefore it is no way probable that their being thus excluded from the *Holy Seed*, was only grounded on the falseness of their pretences to be descended from the *Posterity* of the *Patriarchs*. It is

Chap. 5. is very true they do pretend to be so descended to this very day. They did pretend so in the Age of *Christ* and his *Apostles*. The *Woman* of *Samaria* calls *Jacob* her *Father*, and they were famous for politick Dissemblings of this kind.

S. John IV.
12.

Jos. Ant.
XII. 7.

Jos. Ant.
XI. 8.

Selden.

Whenever the *Fews* were in *Persecution*, they owned themselves to be *Cuthaans*, as in that great and severe *Persecution* of *Antiochus Epiphanes*. Whenever they were *prosperous*, then they pretended themselves to be *Fews*, as in their address to *Alexander the Great* for a Release from the *Tribute* of their *Sabbatical Years*. It is also very true that they were no *Fews* by *extraction*, and that therefore their pretences to *Judaism* were *false*, if that were the meaning of them. But this had been no reason to exclude them from the *Name* and *Privileges* of *Fews*, seeing they were *Profelytes*, and *Profelytes* of the *highest kind*, of *Justice*, not only of the *Gates*. Such *Profelytism* as this the *Rabbins* themselves grant so to incorporate men into the *Jewish Nation*, as to extinguish all other Relations, so that they must thenceforth be reckoned of the *Jewish Nation*, or of none at all. And this *Profelytism* was capable of being extended

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 75

ed to *whole Nations*, as well as to *single persons*. So the *whole Nation* of the *Idumeans* were *profelyted* by the same *Hircanus* who destroyed the *Schismatical Temple* of the *Samaritans*, and much about the same *time*. And it is well known what the Learned *Casaubon* has proved against *Baronius*, who, following some of the ancient *Christians*, makes *Herod the Great* an ἀνόμωτος, who was of the Race of those *Profelyted Idumeans*. He shews that *Herod* himself owns no other *Nation* but that of the *Jews*, nor was counted otherwise by any of the *Age* he lived in. And I am apt to think that it was this Right of *Profelytism* incorporating into the *Jewish Nation* that gave the *Samaritans* that occasion of prevaricating according as their Interest lay. As they were *Profelytes* of *Justice*, so they might challenge all the *Privileges* of the *Jewish Nation* for theirs; Now among the *Privileges* boasted of by the *Jews*, the *Apostle* himself reckons this for one, that theirs were the *Patriarchs*. And therefore they might challenge as good a Title in the *Patriarchs*, as the adopted among the *Romans* had to the *Stemms* and *Images* of the *Families* into which they were adopted, which yet,

Chap. 5.

Josep. Ant.
XIII. 17.

Exercit.

Chap. 5. yet, whilst the memory of their *National Profelytism* was fresh, hindered them not from knowing that their *natural Extraction* was different from that to which they were *intitled* by their *Profelytism*. And accordingly when they renounced their *Profelytism*, as they must have done, in course, whenever they relapsed into *Idolatry*, they must as naturally have resumed their *old Extraction*, as he must among the *Romans*, who had lost his interest in the *Family* into which he had been *adopted*.

Sect. 6. INDEED this Challenge of the *Patriarchs* for *theirs* seems to have been so ordinary for all who pretended to the name of *Jews*, as that even the *Christians* even those who were of *Gentile Extraction*, and had never been *circumcised*, pretend to it, on account of their *mystical Israelitism*. So in the *Reasonings* of *S. Paul*, *Abraham* is the *Father* of all those who are like him in his *Faith* which he had being yet *uncircumcised*. Nay, the *Seed* of his *Faith* are more properly his, than the *Seed* of his *Flesh*. These, in the *mystical Reasonings* of those times, are compared only to *Israel* who was his *Seed* only by the *Bond woman*; but those are they who

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 77

who answer *Isaac*, the *Seed* of the *Free- Chap. 5.*

Woman, who alone was the *Heir* of the *Promises*. The like Challenges of the *Patriarchs* for their own Ancestors are frequent among the first *Christians*, who, in all likelihood, had never been *Jews* by *Extraction*. So *S. Clemens*, whose very name implies his

Ep. I. ad
Corinth.
Sect. 31.

being a *Roman*, τὴν & χεῖρ διλογῶν οὐ

Barn. Ep.
Sect. 9.

ΠΑΤΗΡ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ; *Barnabas*:

Ergo & hi de Testamento sunt; quos dicit
FILIOS ABRAHÆ. de omni-
bus gentibus. S. Fustin a Samaritan:

Dialog.
cum Tryph.
p. 228, 229.

ΙΣΡΑΗΛΙΤΙΚΟΝ ὃ τὸ ἀληθινόν, πνευ-
ματικόν, & ἰσθὰ γλῶσ & ἰακώβ, & ἰσαάκ,
& Ἀβραάμ τῷ ἐν ἀκρεβυστῇ ὅτι τῇ πίστι μαρ-
τυρηθέντι ὑπὸ τῷ θεῷ, & διλογηθέντι, καὶ
πατέρες πολλῶν ἐθνῶν κληθέντι ἡμεῖς ἐσ-
μὲν οἱ διὰ τὸ τῷ θεῷ σκευωθέντι χεῖρ τῷ
θεῷ προσαχθέντες ὡς καὶ προσκοπόντων ἡμῶν
τῶν λόγων ἀποδείχθῃσιν. Elsewhere: ΤΕΚ-
ΝΑ τῷ Ἀβραάμ διὰ τὸ ὁμοίαν πίσιν ὄντες,

ib. p. 347.

Where he accordingly proves it pro-
fessedly, as he had promised before, not
only concerning *Abraham*, but the other

Adv. Hær.
L. IV. c. 18.
Justin. Pa-
tr. p. 1, 2.

Patriarchs. And again, ὡς & μόνον οἱ
ἡμεῖς οἱ & θεὸν κηρύττειν πρέγονοι, προφηταὶ
καὶ νομοθέται. *Irenæus: In regnum*
cælorum

Chap. 5. *cælorum introducit Abraham, & semen ejus quod est Ecclesia.* Which considerations may serve to make it not seem strange if the later *Samaritans* who lived more remote from the memory and practice and privileges of *Profelytism*, mistake the *Legal Challenges* of the *Patriarchs* for their *Ancestors* in their *Predecessors* for Arguments of their *natural Extraction*. However, the *Laws* and *Privileges* of *Legal Profelytism* being allowed for such as has been shewn, this alone will suffice for my design to shew that their *natural Extraction* being otherwise could not have been the inducement that could have moved *Christ* and his *Apostles* to exclude the *Samaritans*, as often as they had occasion to speak of the *Privileged Israel*.

Sect. 7. NOR Secondly is it probable that they were thus excluded from the *Holy Seed* on account of their *Idolatry*. It is true indeed that when they first took up the *Jewish* Religion they still retained their *Idolatrous Customs*. Each *Nation* of them still retained their own *Gods*; the *Babylonians*, *Succoth Benoth*; the *Cuthans*, *Nergal*; and the Men of *Hamath*, *Ashima*; the *Avites*, *Nibhaz* and *Tartak*; and the *Sepharvites* burnt their Children

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 79

Children in fire to *Adrammelech* and *A. Chap. 5.*
nammelech the Gods of the *Sepharvites*.
They made unto themselves (as *Fero-*
boam had done) of the lowest of them
Priests of the *high places*, which *sacri-*
ficed for them in the *Houses* of the *high*
places. 2 King. XVII. 29, 30, 31, 32.
that is, in short *They feared the Lord,*
and served their own Gods, and their gra-
ven Images, after the manner of the Na-
tions. Verse 33. 41. It is also true, that
not only *they*, but their *Children*, and
their *Children's Children* continued to do
so to the time of the *Writer* of the *Book*
of *Kings*, which is supposed to be *Esdras*,
Verse 41. that is to the time of *Ar-*
taxerxes, either *Longimanus* or *Mucmon*,
that is, to the Birth of *Faddus*, whose
Brother *Manasseh* first engaged them in
their *Ecclesiastical Schism*. But this
could not be taken for a *Profelytism* of
Justice, nor do we find that as yet
themselves did ever so much as pretend
to the *Privilege* of *Native Jews*. The
first time that, for certain, they did so,
was in the time of *Alexander* the Great.
But it was a little before that time that
they had now built a *Temple* in imitation
of that of *Ferusalem*, and an *Altar*, and
had gotten a *High Priest* of the *Posterity*
of

Chap. 5. of *Aaron*. From this time forward it is probable they utterly gave over their *Idolatrous* Customs, when they were engaged in an emulation with the *Fews* at *Jerusalem*. It had been an unanswerable Objection against them, by the Principles of *Judaism* if they had continued it. And it is not improbable that *Sanballat* took this way of justifying the cause of his Son-in-Law *Manasses* who was excluded from his Succession at *Jerusalem* only on account of his marriage with his Daughter who was a *Heathen*, that by *Profelyting* his whole *Satrapia* of the *Samaritans*, and among them his own Daughter, he made that *Marriage* lawful by an *After-Act* which had been unlawful before.

Sect. 8. FROM that time there is no evidence that ever they practised it more. The *Samaritans* themselves, in their address to *Antiochus Epiphanes*, make themselves *Sidonians*, and desire that their Temple, which had hitherto no Title of any God, that is, to be sure, of no *Heathen* God, might from that time have the Title of *Jupiter Hellenicus*. Why should they not insist on their true Original from the *Assyrian* Dominions? why should they not rather desire the Title of

Josep. Ant.
XII. 7.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 81

Chap. 3.

of their *Babylonian Idols*, when *Gentilism* was the thing principally designed by *Antiochus*, if after an hundred and sixty years discontinuance they had not forgot their *Idolatries* together with the memory of their *true Extraction*? Their very *Idols* would have disproved their pretending to be of *one Nation*, much more their pretence to be *Sidonians*. And how was it possible that in so short a time they could have forgotten their own *Idols*, if the memory of any the least *Idolatrous Worship* had not been for that space perfectly discontinued? If they had been *ashamed* of it, and so been *willing* to have suppressed the *memory* of it (tho considering the time there be no reason to think that they would have been *ashamed* of it) yet it is not probable the *Fews* would not have upbraided them with it in that famous Dispute between them before *Ptolemaus Philometor*; where they had agreed that they who were overcome should have their Adversaries put to death; Where the Terms of the Dispute were that they were to manage it from the *Law of Moses*. Could they have laid any charge of *Idolatry* against the *Samaritans*, it is no way probable that they

Jos. Ant.
XIII. 6.

G

would

Chap. 5. would ever have *admitted* them to the Dispute concerning the *Succession* of their *Priesthood*. Had the *Samaritans* themselves been conscious to themselves of the *guilt* of such a charge, it is no way probable that they *themselves* would have submitted their Cause to a decision from the *Law*. This was their Case before their Conquest by *Hircannus*. But from that time forward, it is no way probable that they would have been *permitted* in the practice of any *Idolatrous* Worship by the *Jews* their *Masters*, if themselves had been otherwise *inclined* to it, 'as we have no reason to believe they *were*. So that even on this account we have reason to believe all *memory* of their *Idolatrous* Worship would have been extinguished before the times of our *Saviour*, and therefore could have been no cause of *his* excluding them from the number of the *true Israelites*. What their modern Adversaries the *Rabbins* charge them with, their Baptizing in the *Name* of a *Pigeon*, is so extremely groundless as that even Mr. *Selden* himself, who is otherwise far from being too incredulous of that kind of Authors, does yet take this for no better than a downright slander. The same

De Diis
Syr. Syn-
tagmat. II.
cap. 3.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 83

same he grants concerning another *Chap. 5.*
charge of their worshipping an *Asina*,
(undoubtedly for *Asima* the old Idol,
tho it is also very well known that the
Jews themselves were slandered by the *Joseph. c.*
Heathens for worshipping their Law- *Appion.*
giver *Moses* in the shape of an *Ass*)
and another Criticism fathered by them
on the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, which he
and others who have seen Copies from
the *Samaritans* themselves, can prove
false by ocular Demonstration. Nothing
therefore of this kind is probable to have
been the true reason why our Saviour
disowned them for *true Israelites*. Should
one put the most favourable Constructi-
on that can be on these Charges, and
suppose them to have been *Mistakes*,
that the worship of the *Pigeon* in memo-
ry of *Semiramis*, which they had found
ascribed to the *Assyrians*, was by them
particularly laid to the *Cutheans*, whom
they knew to have been an *Assyrian* Co-
lony; and that their former Charges,
whilst they were *Gentiles*, had been al-
so laid to them after their *Profelytism* to
the *Jewish Law*; these had been *Mi-*
stakes likely enough to have been taken
up by them who were so unkillful in
ancient History and *Chronology* as the

Chap. 5. *Rabbins* are known to be by them who have skill enough to judge concerning them.

Sect. 9. THE forementioned *Woman* of *Samaria*, in her Dispute with our *Saviour* himself upon this Argument, plainly states the Controversie as it was disputed at that time, otherwise. Thus it was understood then: *Our Fathers worshiped in this Mountain, and ye say that in Ferusalem is the place where men ought to worship.* Observe that first, by *Worship* is meant the *Confinement* of *Worship*, that is that her *Fathers* so worshiped in *Mount Gerizim* as to condemn the worshipping at *Ferusalem*, and the *Fews* so worshiped at *Ferusalem* as to condemn the worshipping at *Mount Gerizim*. This was the only thing that made any difference between them; for if either of them had so worshiped at their own place as not to condemn the worship of others in the other, there could have been no occasion of breach between them. Observe secondly, that this must therefore have been understood, not of the *Moral*, but the *Ceremonial* Part of *Worship*. For their *Synagogue-Worship*, the *Fews* were so far from confining it to *Ferusalem*, or condemning it in *Samaria*, as that they
allowed

S. John IV.
20.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 85

allowed it in all their Gentile Dispersions, Chap. 5. where notwithstanding they did not count the *Countries* themselves *Holy*, as they did all *Judea*, including *Samaria* under it. And hence it appears thirdly, whom she meant by those whom she calls *our Fathers*. She did not mean the *Fathers* common to them with the *Jews*, as she did before where she reckoned *Jacob* among them; but plainly those *Fathers* who so worshiped in *Samaria* as that they differed therein from those who worshiped at *Jerusalem*, such *Fathers* who differed from the *Jews* as much as their *Posterity* of that *present Age*. Those were plainly they who had sacrificed in the *Samaritan Temple*, and owned the *Samaritan Priesthood*. This *worship* she could truly say had been performed by their *Fathers* who lived before their *Temple* and *Altar* had been ruined by *Hyrcaus*. But she could not pretend it to have been performed by any in her *own Age* who since that time had no *Temple* nor *Altar* to sacrifice on distinct from that in *Jerusalem*. Otherwise, as they continued their *SCHISM*, so it is no way probable, but that even they continued their *Moral Worship* distinct from the *Jews*. And therefore

Chap. 5. plainly this *πεποιθήσεις* wherein they differed from the *Jews* was no other than their *Worship* of *Sacrificing*, and that the same way understood, and the same way justified, as it was practised and justified by those *Samaritans* who lived before the destruction of their *Temple* by *Hyrchanus*. This same practice of *Sacrificing* in the *Temple* at *Mount Gerizim* was that by which the *Samaritans* of that Age defended themselves, nothing of *Idolatry*, or of their false pretences to *Jewish Extraction*. And this, and this alone, must have been the thing condemned in them by our *Saviour* when he gave his judgment against them in this same Dispute.

Sect. 10. THAT we may therefore understand what it was that was condemned by our *Saviour*, we must have recourse to the *History* of those times wherein that was practised, which now was only disputed and defended. And the first occasion of that whole Difference was briefly this: *Manasses* the Brother of *Faddus* the *High Priest* of the *Jews* had married *Nicaso*, a Daughter of *Sanballat*, a *Cuthaan* by Extraction, who had been made *Satrapa* of *Samaria*, his own Country, by *Darius Codomannus*. Upon this

Josep. Ant.
XI. 8.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 87

this the Elders of the *Jews*, in whose *Chap. 5.*
hands the Government was at that time
(*Josephus* himself confesses it to have *Ant. XX.*
been *Aristocratical* then) oblige him to *8.*
a choice either of quitting his *Wife*, or
his *Priesthood*. Immediately he flies to
his *Father-in-Law*, full of Complaints
of what he had suffered from his own
Countrymen for his affection to his
Daughter, and acquaints him that he had
indeed a great affection for *her*, yet not
so great but that he preferred that *great-*
est Honor of his *Family* and *Country* be-
fore her. *Sanballat* assures him that he
should be so far from *losing* any *Honors*
of his *Family* for his *Daughter*, as that,
instead of his *Priesthood*, which as
younger Brother to *Jaddus*, was only
of the ordinary sort, he would make
him *High Priest*, he would build him a
Temple on *Mount Gerizim*, one of the
highest Mountains of *Samaria*, no doubt,
to rival *Mount Moriah*, on which the
Temple of *Jerusalem* was built. For as
their publick Worship was generally in
High Places and *Mountains*, so the *height*
of the *place* tended to advance the *Dig-*
nity of the *Worship* exercised in it. In
allusion whereunto is that expression of
the Prophet, that the *Mountain of the* *Mic. IV. 1.*

Chap. 5. *Lord should be exalted above the top of the Mountains.* This encourages *Manasses*, for a *time*, to wait till he might see how far his *Father in-Law's* Interest might succeed in effecting what he had *promised*, and still his *Party* increased by the accession of other *Criminals* in the same kind with *himself* who daily revolted to him.

SECT. II. BUT before *Sanballat* could communicate this design to his Master *Darius*, he had received his second Defeat at *Iffus*. *Sanballat* hereupon takes this occasion of following the Conqueror, whom he found at the Siege of *Tyre*. There he acquaints him with his Design, and tells him how much it would be for his *interest*, by that new Project, to divide the powerful and rebellious Nation of the *Jews*. So the elder *Sanballat*, contemporary to *Nehemiah*, had likewise represented them. And he found it the less difficult to prevail with him, because he had been a little before provoked by a Message returned to him, whereby they gave him to understand that they were already ingaged to *Darius* by their Oaths, and could not take up Arms against him while he lived. Having therefore got his leave, he immediately

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 89

diately falls to his Work of Building this *Chap. 4.*
new *Temple*, which he seems also to
have finished within those *seven Months*
which were spent in the *Siege of Tyre*,
and the two at *Gaza*, for within that
time he *dies*. From that time forward
to the time of the elder *Hyrcauus*, this
was the place of *publick Worship* for the
Samaritans, as *Ferusalem* for the *Jews*,
Sanballat himself, and his *Daughter*, and
his whole *Province* having been *Profely-*
zed to it.

HERE was again an *Altar* and a *Sett. 12.*
Temple independent on those at *Ferusa-*
lem, designed purposely to cut off their
Communication in their *Anniversary*
Solemnities. They were henceforth so
far from joyning in their *Anniversaries*,
which, as I said, were the *Prerogatives*
of the *Temple*, as that they mortally
hated each other, and refused the com-
mon Civilities of *Conversation*. But this
distinction of their *Altar* was com-
mon with the other forementioned
SCHISMS. The distinction of the
One Priesthood is that which first appear-
ed *here*, and was, in truth, the thing
principally mentioned in this Dispute,
before *Ptolemaus Philometor*. It is
there granted on both sides that the *High*
Priesthood

Chap. 5. *Priesthood* ought to be but *One* (it is plainly the *High Priesthood* they dispute, so far is it from an *Ordinary Priest* of a single Congregation which none ever doubted but they *might* be, and *were* many.) The Dispute is who had the *Right* to it. This is the thing which they endeavour to make out from the Topick of *Succession*. That was again urged by *Andronicus* the Advocate for the *Jews*: ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ τῇ διαδοχῇ τῇ Ἀρχιερέων, ὡς ἕκαστος ἀπὸ πατρὸς τῷ πτωχῷ ἐκδεξάμενος ἠρξεν τὸν ναὸν. From the *Law* no doubt his first proof was brought that the *High Priesthood* ought to be but *one*; and concerning the *Succession* the proof was not from the *Law*, as it is taken for the *Pentateuch*, but as it includes the other *Historical Books* of the *Old Testament*. By that it appeared that a *Temple* had been at *Jerusalem* from the time of *Solomon* to the time of *Sanballat*, abating only the time of the seventy years Captivity. It appeared that there was a constant *Succession* of *High Priests* in that *Temple* at *Jerusalem*, whilst as yet there was no *Temple* at *Samaria*, *Josephus* himself reckons thirteen from *Aaron* to *Solomon's Temple*, then *under the Temple* Eighteen. Then after

Jos. Ant.
XIII. 6.

Jos. Ant.
XX. 8.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 91

after the return from the Captivity, *Jesus Chap. 5.*
the Son of *Josedec*, and Fifteen of his
Posterity to the time of *Antiochus Eu-*
pator, &c. In all likelyhood these Ca-
talogues of the *Succession* of their *High*
Priests were first gathered and cast into
these Distinctions by them who first
managed this Dispute concerning the
Succession of the *High Priesthood* against
the *Samaritans*. And by these Cata-
logues it again appears that the *One*
Priesthood, so much then disputed of,
was meant only of the *High Priesthood*,
seeing it was only of the Names of such
that their Catalogues consisted.

T H E R E are also some other In- *Sect. 13.*
stances to which the Phrases of erect-
ing *Altars* against *Altars*, and the pro-
faness of such *Altars* so erected, might
possibly relate, which yet I do not think
so apposite to my present Design, be-
cause they were rather of *Idolaters* than
SCHISMATICKS. These were
of *Rival Altars* erected within the very
Jurisdiction of the *True Altar*, and
with a design of slighting, and laying
the use of it aside. Such was that of
Ahaz which he caused to be copied from
the *Altar of Damascus*. This *Altar* he
erected in the *Temple*, and caused the
Brazen

Chap. 5. *Brazen Altar of God to be removed for it, and gave Urijah the Priest this charge concerning them: Upon the great Altar (so he called his own new One) burn the morning burnt-offering, and the evening meat-offering, and the kings burnt-sacrifice, and his meat-offering, with the burnt-offering of all the people of the land, and their meat-offering, and their drink-offerings, and sprinkle upon it all the blood of the burnt-offering, and all the blood of the sacrifice: and the brazen altar shall be for me to enquire by. Plainly this Altar was in emulation to the true Altar. It was erected in the same Temple, nay, as it should seem, in the same part of the Temple, for the other was removed for it. It was designed for most of those Sacrifices which had formerly been offered on the Altar, so that now the true Altar had no other use, but for such Sacrifices whereby the God of Israel was to be consulted. It was plainly designed as the principal Altar of the two; for it was called the great Altar, and the other was removed for it, and it had much the greater part of the Temple Worship performed at it. Possibly it was his Example that was imitated by his Grandson Manasseh, among whose wickednesses*

2 King.
XVI. 15.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 93

wickednesses this is also reckoned as one *Chap. 5.*

of the most provoking, *That he also built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of the Lord, that is within the Jurisdiction of the true Altar.* *2 King. XXI. 4, 5. 2 Chron. XXXIII.*

For so it is aggravated before, that he

built *Altars in the house of the Lord, of which the Lord said, in Jerusalem will I put my name.* The like is also observed

concerning the *Altar of Antiochus Epiphanes* in the vulgar *Latine* (for our *English* from the *Greek* is somewhat different)

Et quintâ & vicesimâ die mensis sacrificabant super aram qua erat contra Altare. *1 Maccab. l. 62. Lat. 59 Engl.*

Here is *Ara contra Altare*, almost the very Phrase of *S. Cyprian*, who yet I believe borrowed his Phrase rather from the *things*, than any *Forms of Words*, as they had been practised in those known Disputes between the *Jews* and the *Samaritans*.

THERE is also another instance reducible to this purpose, if we may believe the modern *Jews*, I mean

the *Temple of Onias* in *Heliopolis* in *Egypt*. I dispute not now how ill grounded that *Fact* of *Onias* was on the Prophecy of *Isaias* by him pretended for it.

I dispute not how indecorously that particular place of *Heliopolis* was chosen for

Sect. 14.

Vide Selden de Succes. in Pontif. Ebraeor. II. 8.

Chap. 5. for it, which was the *Metropolis* of the *Egyptian Worship*, which was by the *Jews* condemned as *Idolatrous*, and a-bounded more than any other place of *Egypt* it self with monuments of those *Idolatries*. This was an Observation so very obvious, as that it was taken notice of by *Ptolemy Philometor* himself in the very Rescript whereby he gave *Onias* leave to build it. But this *Temple*, as it was built with no ill design of *opposition*, but only as a *fulfilling* of that *Prophecy*; so I do not find that it was ever managed so as to cause the least *animosity*, much less any *SCHISM*, between the *Egyptian* and the *Palestine Jews*. When it was first built, the *Temple of Jerusalem* seems to have lain in its desolation by *Antiochus*. For the immediate occasion of the *Flight* of *Onias* into *Egypt* was his own *Exclusion* from the *Succession* into the *Priesthood* upon the Murder of his Father by the Practices of his Uncle *Menelaus*. There was at that time an old grudge between *Antiochus Epiphanes* and *Ptolemeus Philometor*. Immediately before his Attempts on the *Temple*, *Antiochus* was but newly return'd from *Egypt* from an attempt he had made on *Ptolemy*, being diverted from it only by an

Ap. Joseph.
Ant. XIII.
6.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 95

an interposition of the *Romans* in that famous Embassie delivered to him by *Popilius Lenas*. And indeed *Judea* it self had not long before been made over to *Ptolemaus Epiphanes* by *Antiochus the Great*, and was newly taken from the *Egyptians* by *Antiochus Epiphanes* in that same invasion. This was the occasion that both those Princes had *Designs* and *Parties* in *Judea*, and were very ready to hearken to any attempts that were made in favour of their own interest. *Jason* was the first that undermined *Onias's Father* by an application to *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and indeed that first invited that Prince into the invasion of his own Country. And accordingly upon the Conquest *Onias* was put by, and *Jason* substituted in his room by the interest of *Antiochus*. Yet he himself was within three years undermined also by his Brother *Menelaus*. In the time of this mans *Priesthood* it was that the *Temple* was prophaned by *Antiochus*. Afterwards in the time of *Antiochus Eupator*, in the tenth year of the *Priesthood* of *Menelaus*, he is put to death by order of the young *Antiochus*, and *Alcimus* a person no way related to the *Priestly Family* substituted in his stead,
about

Chap. 5. about the year one hundred and fifty of the *Seleucide* precisely. This was the *time*, and the posture of *Affairs* when *Onias* fled into *Egypt*.

Josep. Ant.
XII. 15.

Seet. 15. HEREUPON he is gladly received by *Ptolemy*, who was willing, by his means, to revive his Interest in *Judaea*. Accordingly he proposes this Expedient of a new *Temple*, as a means whereby he might gain the *Jewish Nation* on his side, that this would make

Josep. Bell.
Jud. VII.
30.

Antiochus more odious, and *Ptolemy* more acceptable to them, if whilst *Antiochus* was prophaning their *Old Temple*, *Ptolemy* would build them a new. *Josephus* does indeed charge *Onias* with some resentment against his Countrymen in this Design. But against whom was this resentment? Against *Alcimus*, one who had no Title to the *Priesthood* but meer intrusion, whereas *Onias* himself was the true Heir by lawful Descent. Against one who had himself consented to the *Heathen Idolatries*, and the *Prophanations* of the *Temple* after it had been expiated by *Judas*. What Sanctity could have been in such a *Priest*, tho he had been more Lawful, and *Onias* more Unlawful than indeed they were? This *Temple* therefore was built in such a time

I Maccab.
IX. 54.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 97

Chap. 5

a time wherein neither the *Temple*, nor the *Altar*, nor the *High Priest* of the *Temple* of *Ferusalem* were indeed worthy of any *emulation*. And yet when he designed the building his *new Temple*, he desires leave to build it not only to the same *Deity*, whom he calls μέγιστον θεόν but also καθ' ὁμοίωσιν τῷ ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις, and τοῖς αὐτοῖς μετρίσι. And *Josephus* adds, that he did accordingly. These are his express words: λαβὼν ἔν τ' τόπον ὁ οὐίας, κατεσκευάσεν ἱερὸν καὶ βωμόν τῷ θεῷ ὅμοιον τῷ ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις, μικρότερον καὶ πενιχρότερον. These Words should refer to the ἱερὸν as well as the βωμός, that they may answer the Petition. This, as I said before, was indeed, according to the Customs of that Age, to be understood as a communicating with the *Temple* in *Ferusalem*, as I shewed in the Case of *Ahaz*, that his Copying the *Altar* of *Damascus*, was a communicating with the *Syrian Idolatry*. And not only so, but it was also plainly an owning a dependence on the *Temple* at *Ferusalem*, when that was owned as the Prototype from whence their own was Copied, and when withal this was designed less than that from whence it was Copied. This we

Joseph. Ant.
XIII. 6.

H

never

Chap. 5. never find to have been done by the *Samaritans*, or any others who pretended to rival the *Temple at Ferusalem*. This is expressly mentioned in the *Petition* of *Onias*, on which, according to the Forms of those Times, the *Rescript* of the Prince was grounded, and by which it was to be interpreted, that the same thing, and nothing else was granted but that which had been mentioned in the *Petition*. And therefore I cannot but admire at *Josephus*, who notwithstanding elsewhere tells us, that his *Temple* was like a *Tower*, and not like that of *Ferusalem*, tho withal he confesses that the *Altar* was exactly Copied from the *Altar of Ferusalem*. I doubt *Josephus* never saw it. Only this is certain, that if he had varied from what he mentioned in his *Petition*, this had been alone sufficient to have invalidated the *Grant* of *Ptolemy* to him, and might have been so interpreted by them who had been *Enemiesto* his *Design*.

Jos. Bell.
Jud. VII.
30.

Seet. 16. BUT besides this, there are also other things that shew that he designed no *SCHISM* from the *Temple* and *Altar* of *Ferusalem*. Himself, in the same *Petition*, observes, how *Diversity* of *Temples*, *ἡ δὲ τὸ κατ' ἑκάστην*, had bred *Animosities*,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 99

Animosites, not in his own Nation only, Chap. 5.

but also among the *Egyptians* themselves. Would he *preface* his Design with such *Reflections* as these, if his own design had been liable to the same Charge? Nay, he plainly professes in the *Petition* it self, that his design was to unite the *Jews* in *Egypt* thereby for *Ptolemy's* Service. But was it so to unite them among themselves as to divide them from those of their own Nation in *Palestine*? This had been so far from doing *Ptolemy* any service, as that it must have alienated them who were capable of doing him the greatest service against *Antiochus*. It would have been very doubtful; whether would have been hated most by the *Jews* of *Jerusalem*; *Antiochus* for prophaning their Temple, or *Ptolemy* for causing a division among themselves. But *Josephus* tells us elsewhere that *Onias* hoped hereby to draw away the multitude from *Jerusalem*. What multitude was this but those who were disaffected to the prophane *Aleimus*, that is, who were indeed, at that time, on the more *Orthodox* side? And could he expect to prevail on them by any thing that, by the Principles of that Age, would have been owned as *SCHISMATICAL*?

Bell. Jud.
VII. 30.

Chap. 5. ON the contrary, it appears, by
 Sect. 17. the event, that this *Heliopolitane Temple*, if it united the *Egyptian Jews* among themselves, did notwithstanding not disunite them from their Brethren at *Ferusalem*. After this time we find as fair a correspondence, and as great evidences of mutual and hearty affection as ever. Accordingly among those devout persons who came from every Nation under Heaven (that is where the *Jews* had Colonies) to keep the Feast of *Pentecost* at *Ferusalem* (which was one of the three *Anniversaries*) we find those of *Egypt*,
 Act. II. 10. and those of the parts of *Libya* about *Cyrene*, that is, of the *Pentapolitane Libya*, which had also belonged to the *Ptolemies*, till it was bequeathed to the *Romans* by *Ptolemaus Apion*. It seems then that the *Heliopolitane temple* was not designed to encroach on that *Prerogative* of the *Temple* at *Ferusalem* for the *Solemn Anniversaries*. As soon almost as that new *Temple* was built we see what loving Letters passed between the *Jews* of *Ferusalem* and their Brethren in *Alexandria*
 2 Macc. 1. in the Book of *Maccabees*. *Onias* himself fell into the trouble mentioned in the Third Book of the *Maccabees* after the death of *Ptolemy Philometor*, as *Josephus*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 101

sephus much more probably places it, *Chap. 5.* than others who will have it under *Ptolemy Philopater*. *Josephus* one of *Ferusalem* does highly commend his behaviour on that occasion. When *Mithridates* and *Antipater* brought succor to *Cæsar* in the *Alexandrian* War, the first resistance that was like to have been made, was by the *Fews* of *Onias's* Country, that is of the very place where *Onias's* Temple was built. But when *Antipater* had acquainted them that the *High Priest* himself *Hyrchanus* was engaged in that Quarrel, they let him pass. How was it possible they could have had that reverence for the name of the *High Priest* if they had themselves been engaged in a *SCHISM* against him? Had it been so, no name could have been more odious to them, and unlikely to prevail. The like may appear from their mutual concernment for the *Calamities* of their Nation in both places. How heartily was *Philo* interested in the Troubles of the *Palestine Fews* under *Petronius* in the time of *Cains*? Nay, *Philo* is express against any *Altar* or *Temple* in opposition to that of *Ferusalem*, and is for all going thither at what distance soever. And on the contrary,

Cont. Apion. II. p. 1064.

Joseph. Ant. XIV. 14.

Phil. Leg. ad Cajum.

De Monar. Lib. II. mit.

Chap. 5. how much was *Josephus* concerned for his Brethren in *Alexandria*, in their Troubles under the Præfectship of *Tiberius Alexander*?

Jos. Bell.
Jud. II. 21.

Sect. 18. I AM therefore apt to think that there were no more *High Priests* continued in the *Heliopolitane Temple* by *Onias*, who during his own time had the best Right to it in *Jerusalem*, and while the Temple was prophaned, and things in disorder, so that the *High Priesthood* was not disposed of till the time of *Fonathan*; he was not capable of having a *Competitor*, and it is not unlikely but that he yielded it to *Fonathan*, being now so engaged in his Prince's Affairs in *Egypt* as that he was unwilling to remove for the *High Priesthood* it self. From that time forward, it does not appear that there was any *Succession* of the *High Priesthood* continued at *Heliopolis*. There was indeed an *Altar*. There were also *Priests* and *Levites* endowed by *Ptolemy* with maintenance for attendance on that *Altar*. This *Succession* of *Priests* was continued till the time that the Temple was shut up by the command of *Vespasian*. For even then *Josephus* tells us that *Paulinus*, the Successor of *Lupus* who had shut it up, extorted

Bell. Jud.

ed

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 103

ed from the *Priests* an account of the *Donatives* which had been bestowed upon it. But there is not the least intimation of any *High Priest* in it at that time. Now such a *Succession* as this would only imply a use of it for *ordinary Sacrifices*, so as the *high places* had been used before, after the confinement of the publick worship to a certain place, which tho they might be *irregular*, yet were not *SCHISMATICAL*, whilst they owned a dependence on the place of *publick Worship*. Yet even these *high places* were legitimated when they were used by a *Prophet*, and even the *modern Jews* acknowledge that the *Authority* of a *Prophet* did extend so far as to excuse for the breach of a *positive Law* of such a nature as this was. How much more such a *Prophet* as *Isaiah*? How much more in a *Writing*, which was a *standing Rule* to their *Church* of *Authority* not inferior to that of the *Law* it self? Certainly of much more *Authority* than that of any *present inspiration* of any *Prophet* in his *life-time*?

THIS was thought a sufficient Argument with the *Hellenists* of that time to authenticate a thing so seemingly different from the *Letter* of the *Law* as this

Chap. 5. was, and it was the same Argument, drawn from the like uncondemned Concessions of the *Hellenists*, that was made use of by the first *Christians* to justify all their seeming Deviations from the *Letter* of the *Law*, by the like *Predictions* of the *Prophets* concerning the *later days*. This Observation will both let us *Christians* see how strong this *Reasoning* is, seeing it is of the same kind with that by which most of the *Peculiarities* of the *Christian Religion*, as different from *Judaism*, were proved in those *first* and *purest* times; and will withal let our Adversaries see how *prudent* and *credible* this Argument was, as it was managed by the first *Christians*, being the same by which *Prophecies* and *Predictions* were expounded and applyed in those *Ages* wherein *Prophecies* were most familiar in *ordinary practice*, and wherein the *Spirit* of *Prophecy* was thought as necessary for expounding *Prophecies* already *symbolically* revealed to others, as it was to those to whom the *Revelations* were *first* made.

Sec. 20. BESIDES these now mentioned, there are also other *Temples* of the *Jews* mentioned in the forementioned Address of the same *Onias*, which I do not know whether

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 105

whether any Author besides now extant has ever mentioned. His words are

these: γενόμενος ἔντε τῇ πόλει Συρία, καὶ Joser. Ant. XIII. 6.

φοινίκη, καὶ εἰς Λεόντων ἢ πόλιν τῶν ἑλισποχίτων

σὺν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, καὶ εἰς ἄλλας πόλεις ἀφικόμενος τῶν ἑθνῶν, καὶ πολλὰς διὰ τῶν

καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἔχοντας ἱερῶν, καὶ διὰ τῶν τοῦ δυνάστη

ἀλλήλοις, &c. That is, *Having conversed*

with the Jews in Celo-Syria and Phæ-

nice, and in the Leontopolis in the He-

liopolitane Nomus (to distinguish it

from that which was the Head of a No-

mus by it self) and having travelled to

several other places where Colonies were

planted of the same Nation, and finding

most of them engaged in Sacred Rites un-

lawful for them, and for that cause dis-

affected to each other, &c.. But I can

hardly think that these were purely

SCHISMATICAL Temples, but

rather Idolatrous. If that had been his

meaning, it was strange he should for-

get the most famous, notorious Instance

of all, that of the Samaritans, which

was then in its most flourishing condi-

tion. It is strange that no others should

mention any Temples built by the Jews

in those places, not even Josephus him-

self who had undertaken the History of

all

Chap. 5. all the Memorables of his own Nation. I incline therefore rather to translate ~~it~~ in this place by the name rather of *Sacred Rites* than of *Temples*, not as if the *Fews* had in these places any *Temples* of their own, but that, according to their natural *sickleness* in their own Worship, and their complaisance to the *Heathens*, to whom they made themselves odious by* their *singularity*, they yielded to the *Idolatrous* Customs of the *places* where they lived. For shewing how probable this was I need not have recourse to their *ancient* frequent Relapses into *Idolatry*. A very Learned (a) Gentleman conceives they were involved in this guilt in that *Anniversary Commemoration* mentioned by (b) *Philo*, as observed by them together with the other *Alexandrians*, in memory of their *Law*, translated there by the order of *Philadelphus*. This *Anniversary* he conceives to have been designed by the *Heathens* in honor of *Isis Pharia*. But there is another occasion mentioned in the *History* of that *Translation*, for the Commemoration of the *Heathens*. That was the *Victory* at Sea gained by the Forces of *Ptolemaus Lagi* over the Fleet of *Antigonus* on that *same day*, which the

(a) Sir
John May-
sham Chr.
Can. Sect.
IX.
(b) Vit.
Mos. III.

the King seems purposely to have joyn- Chap. 5.
ed with the *Commemoration* of the *Trans-*
lation, that the *Commemoration* of
both together might be more general
and solemn. Tho I deny not but that
Deity might be she to whom the *Hea-*
thens returned their *thanks* for that *Sea-*
Victory. Whether the *Fews* joyned
with them in that part of their Address
is not so certain from this Passage.

IT is somewhat clearer in the Epistle Sect. 21.
of *Adrian* to *Servianus*. He there tells
us that the very *Patriarch* was compelled
by some to worship *Serapis*, by others to
worship *Christ*. If the name *Patriarch*
were not an Argument, which does not
seem to have been taken up by the *Chri-*
stians till the time of *Montanus*, nor by
the *Catholicks* for some considerable time
after, yet the being *compelled* to worship
Christ, the same way as he was *compelled*
to worship *Serapis*, plainly imply him to
have been as *averse* to *Christianity* as
Heathenism. In the same *Epistle* he tells
us that the same God (an *Idolatrous* one,
no doubt, when he produces it as an
Argument of the *Alexandrian Levity*)
was worshiped in common by the *Chri-*
stians, *Fews* and *Heathens*. But a clear-
er instance hereof was in the worship of
the

Ap. Vopisc.
in Saturni-
na.

Chap. 5. the Oak at Mamre. There were *Idols* and an *Idolatrous Altar*, so scandalous as that it was taken away by *Constantine*. Yet because their Fore father *Abraham* was concerned in it, the *Fews* also are reckoned among those who had frequented that place on a superstitious Account.

Sozom. II.

4. Euseb.

Demon.

V. 9. & de

loc. Ebr.

Ἀρεῶν.

Rit. con-

stantin. III.

51, 52, 53.

Sect. 22.

THIS therefore being a thing to which the *Fews* were so very obnoxious, as *Onias* had observed by his Travels among them in their Colonies, where they were in the most danger of being thus corrupted by their conversation with *Idolaters*; and being withal a thing which must, in course, make animosities among them, provoke against them the just zeal of their Brethren in *Jerusalem*, who were not in the same danger as they were who lived among *Heathens*: *Onias* thought to remedy these inconveniences by building the *Egyptian Fews* a Temple of their own to the Supreme God, μεγίστω Θεῷ, which was the God worshiped by them, not the particular Demons of Places, or Nations, or Cities, of which kind all were that were worshiped by the *Heathens* in a publick way, by Temples and Sacrifices. For by having thus a Temple of their

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 109

their own, they were taken off from the *Chap. 5.*
Temptation of frequenting the *Hea-*
then Temples and *Sacrifices*; by being
preserved from this they were kept
righter in the good opinion of their *Bre-*
thren at *Jerusalem*; by being kept so,
their *whole Nation*, both those in *Egypt*,
and those in *Palestine*, were better di-
posed to drive on *common designs*, and
with *common interest*, for the purposes
of *Ptolemy*, and against that of *Antio-*
chus. This seems plainly to have been
the Intrigue aimed at by *Onias* in this
whole design. And this supposes that
the Temples alluded to by him, were
rather the *Idolatrous Temples* of the *Hea-*
thens of those places, than any *Schisma-*
tical ones proper to the *Jews* themselves.

CHAP. VI.

The Privilege of the Jews, as the Segullah, or Peculiar People, consisted in having the Supreme Being appropriated to them for their God.

The CONTENTS.

The Force of this Argument as applied by the Jews to their SCHISMATICKS from Judaism. I. The God of Israel was indeed so proper to the Israelites, as the Gods of the Nations were to their respective Nations. Sect. I. The Dæmons of the Nations were only of limited Power and Jurisdiction, and, as they thought, overpowered when the Nations, for whom they were concerned, were conquered. Sect. II, III. The Privilege of the Jews, as the Segullah, consisted in this, That whereas none but Inferior Dæmons were appointed for the Tutelars of other Nations, the Supreme Being was pleased to undertake the management of them immediately, in his own person. Sect. IV, V, VI,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 111

VI, VII. *The Advantages the Jews Chap. 6.*
had above other Nations in this regard.

Sect. VIII. *Wherein consisted the Sin*
of worshiping those Tutelary De-
mons. Sect. IX, X, XI. How Angels
were employed by God in the Govern-
ment of the Jews. Sect. XII. Where-
in God's peculiar Care of the Jews
consisted. Sect. XIII.

THUS I think I have gone through *Sect. I.*
all the *Temples* and *Altars* that
might any way be thought alluded to in
the Argument of which I am at present
discourfing. And I am apt to think
that those of the *Samaritans* were prin-
cipally intended in those *Reasonings* of
the *Primitive Christians*. I fhall now
proceed to fhew the force of this *Reason-*
ing as it was firft ufed by the *Jews*
againft their *SCHISMATICKS*
from *Judaism*; and from thence 2.
how forcible it is as deduced and apply-
ed by the *first Christians* to the Cafe of
SCHISMATICKS from *Christi-*
stianity. And 3: how appofitely their
Reasonings fit the Cafe alfo of our
modern SCHISMATICKS.
1. Then, for the *Reasonings* of the
Jews

Chap. 6. *Fews* against their *SCHISMATICKS*, I desire it may be remembred 1. That, the *God* of *Israel* was indeed so proper to the *Nation* of the *Israelites*, as the *Gods* of the *Nations* were to their respective *Nations*. This was indeed the Popular Notion, that each *Nation* had a *God* proper to it self; as is clear from *Tertullian*, *Minutius*, *Athanasius*, and the rest of the Apologists as they have occasion to mention it; that as every *Nation* had a *Tutelar Daemon* of its own, so there was also a mutual confinement on both sides, that *He* should be their *God*, and *They* should be his *People*; that is, that *He* should confine himself to the care of that *People*, and them alone, and that *they*, and none but *they*, should have a *Right* to worship him, and a *Title* to his *Care*, and that *they* should also confine themselves to worship none but *him*, or by his *leave*. This plainly seems implied in all those Differences and *Fightings* of the *Gods* in *Homer*; (like that of *Michael* the *Angel* of the *Fews* fighting against the *Prince* of the *Persians*, Dan. X. 20.) not that the *Gods* themselves were thought to have any animosities against each other, but that, on account of this confinement of their

care

Tertull. A-
polog. c.
24. Min.
Fel Oñ.
44. Athan.
or advers.
Gent. p. 25.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 113

Chap. 6.

care to their own Nations, it was impossible but that they must abet contrary designs, when the good of one Nation was grounded on the calamity of the other. Then the God who was concerned for the suffering Nation, endeavoured to remove or alleviate the Suffering; or if he could, to divert it on the Nation whose greatness he looked on as prejudicial to his own Cure. And on the contrary, the God that was concerned for the Conquering Nation endeavoured all he was able to reach the happiness designed for his own People, and to defeat the designs of the Demons concerned against him. The Stoicks would Allegorize all those Differences into the natural contrariety of the Principles of the Universe, as the strife between Scamander and Vulcan was from the contrariety between Fire and Water. This might possibly answer the Poets design, as to the Powers by which those contrary Demons promoted their contrary Interests; that the Power of Vulcan consisted in his Fire, as the Power of Scamander in his Water. But why the Power of the Fire and the Sea, Vulcan and Neptune should be concerned against the Trojans, especially that of the Air,

I which

Chap. 6. which is common to all, that is, *Funo*. Why *Apollo*, that is, the *Sun*, should be for the *Trojans*, and against the *Gracians*, this cannot be accounted for but by a *confinement* of the *care* of the *Deities* themselves. Besides this way of *Allegorizing* the *Gods* into *Principles* of *Nature* was lately brought into use by the *Stoicks*, and is very uncertain whether it was ever *designed* by the first contrivers of these *Mythological Stories*.

Sect. 2. NOR is this to be thought so *strange* if it be considered that these *Deities* themselves were not thought to be of the *Supreme*, but of the *inferior* order of *Deities*. They were supposed, even by them who worshiped them, to have *limited Powers* only as well as *limited Dominions*, and accordingly as their *Powers* lay, so they were thought to be mutually *weaker* and *stronger* than each other. Usually the first occasion of erecting *Altars* to them was some *Experiment* of a *Benefit* received from them which was mentioned either in the *Title* by which they afterwards worshiped him, or *inscribed* on the *Altars* so erected by them. And as they judged by the *event* wherein their *Powers* lay, so they did also judge which of them was

more

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 115

more powerful. Thus the *Philistines* Chap. 6.
judge concerning the God of the *Israel*,
whom they took only for a *Tutelar* of
Israel. *Wo unto us: who shall deliver*
us out of the hand of these mighty Gods? ^{1 Sam. IV.}
^{8.}

these are the Gods that smote the Egyptians
with all the plagues in the wilderness.
They thought the God of the *Ebrens*
more powerful than the Gods of the *E-*
gyptians, because he had overthrown
their People, and therefore feared lest
he might be too powerful for *theirs*.
Thus God got him glory over the Gods
of the *Egyptians* in being reputed more
powerful than *they*. ^{Exod. XII.}
^{12.} So again when they

had conquered the *Ark*, they place it in
the Temple of their *Dagon*, no doubt,
as a Trophy of the *Victory* of their
Dagon over the God of the *Ebrens*, for
it was the *Ark* that they had also been so
fearful of before as a *Symbol* of the pre-
sence of the God of the *Ebrens*. The
same was the notion of the *Syrians*,
when being defeated by the *Israelites*,
they concluded that the God of the
Israelites was the God of the *Hills*, but
that their own Gods were Gods of the ^{1 King.}
^{XX. 23,}
^{28.} *Valleys*; and therefore they hoped
might prevail against the God of the
Ebrens, if they might deal with his

Chap. 6. *People in the Valleys.* Plainly supposing that the *God of Israel*, as well as their *own Gods*, was a particular *Tutelary Demon* over the *Nation of Israel*; That their own *Demons* were in some things *inferior to him*, as well as *he* was in other things *inferior to them*; and that therefore none of them were the *Supreme Being* which we call *God* in the appropriated Notion. So also *Sennacherib*, when he boasts that none of the *Gods of the Nations* had delivered his Land out of the hand of the King of *Assyria*, and thence concludes that the *God of Israel* was not likely to deliver his *People* from him, was not certainly so vain as to think that he a *mortal creature* could be more powerful than any *Demon* of what rank soever, but that his own *Demon* of his own *Nation* was more powerful than the *Demon of Fudea*, as well as he had proved himself more powerful than the *Demons* of those other Nations which had been subdued by his *People*. Accordingly when *God* foretels the ruine of the *Assyrian Monarchy*, he does it so as to *insult* over their *Gods*, who should neither be able to deliver their *People*, nor their *Images*, from being carried *captive* with them.

And

2 King.
XVIII. 33.
35.

II. XLVI. I.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 117

And one of the most powerful Pleas *Chap. 6.*
with *God* to prevail with him to pass by
the Sins of his own *People*, is the dis-
honor that would otherwise redound to
his own *name*, the reproach of his Ad-
versaries, who would thence conclude
that he was *unable* either at first to *save*,
or after to *deliver*, his Captivated
People.

AGREEABLY hereunto they *Sett. 3.*
ascribe all the *Felicities* and *Infelicities*
of their *Nations* to the conduct of their
Deities. If any Design succeeded with
more than ordinary *Prosperity*, they re-
signed the whole Glory and Acknow-
ledgment, not to their own *Prudence* or
Courage, but to the vigilancy and power
of their Tutelary *Deity*. To *him* they
payed their *Vows*; They crowned his
Statues; They adorned his *Temple*;
They appointed *Festivities* and *Solemni-
ties*, and sometimes *Anniversaries*, for
the commemoration of it by the Body
of the *People*; To *him* they sung their
Hymns, they offered their *Eucharistical
Sacrifices*, they devoted their *Leetiften-
nia*, their *Plays* and *Dances*, and all their
Customs of expressing their Publick
Foy: To *him*, and in his *Temple* they
hung up their *Trophies* and the *Spoils* of
I 3 their

Chap. 6. their Enemies, as if he alone had been the Author of their whole Success. So also in their *Calamities*, when irremediable, they did not, in the Nations bordering on *Palestine*, ascribe such, as afterwards in the *mythical* Times of the *Heathens*, either to an over-ruling *Fate*, or to an *Indignation* or *Desertion* of their *Demon*. They never thought his *Chastisements* could extend to *Extermination*; nor do they seem to have believed that the *Supreme Being* so far concerned himself as a *Party* in the Transactions between *Nations* and their *Tutelary Demons*, as that any thing was determined by his immediate interposition, which disbelief of theirs destroys the very Foundation of this most ancient Notion of *Fate*. These other Refuges therefore being thus precluded, the most obvious account remaining that could be given by them of such calamities, could not be the want of *good will* or *care* in their *Demons* for their Relief, but only their want of *Power*, as the Fortune-teller told *Anthony*, that his *Genius* dreaded the *Genius* of *Augustus*. Hereupon it came to pass that the Nations rivalled one another in the honor of their *Tutelary Demons*, as indeed conceiving that

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 119

that Nation most favoured by the Supreme Being which had the most powerful Genius allotted to it. And indeed they judged of the Power of their Genius by the Success and Prosperity of the Nation for which he was concerned. Thus it is that the God of Israel himself rivals those respective Tutelaries, when, according to their Notions concerning him, he personates himself the part only of a Tutelary. Their God was not like the Gods of the Nations, their Enemies themselves being Judges. This his Enemies were to judge from the greatness of his Deliverances of his People by the many Signs and Wonders wrought for his People beyond any thing that ever was pretended of that kind in behalf of any of the Gods of the Nations. This was gathered from the Glory and Evidence of his Manifestations: Enquire from the ancient days which were before thee, from the day wherein God created man upon the earth, whether any such thing was ever done or known, That a people heard the voice of the Lord God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and lived. This was also gathered from the Wisdom of their Laws, for that was also taken for another principal instance

Deuteron.
XXXII.
31.

Deut. IV.
32, 33.

Chap. 6. wherein the care of their Tutelar was thought to be concerned. So he reasons
 Is.v. 6, 7, 8. elsewhere: *This is your wisdom and understanding among the Peoples, that when they shall hear of these Precepts, they shall say, This is a wise and understanding People, a great Nation. Neither is there any other Nation which hath Gods so near them as the Lord our God is near unto us in all wherein we call upon him. For what Nation is there that hath Laws and Statutes and Judgments so righteous as these which I set before you this day. Thus God proves the happiness of the Jews in having him as a Tutelary, that they were by so much more secure of a prosperous condition under his Government as he was more able to protect them than the Demons of other Nations. And if it was counted a higher degree of favour to have a more powerful Genius, much more it was to have an Omnipotent One, to have the God of those Gods, the distributor and allotter of all those Provinces to those several Genii. This was a favour, not only beyond the enjoyment, but the expectation also, of any other Nation.*

Sect. 4.

THIS Doctrine, That the Jews alone, and no other Nation besides, was under

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 121

under the *immediate* care and providence Chap. 6.
of the *Supreme Being* is so far from being
a *Paradox*, as that indeed it is the Do-
ctrine of the *Scriptures* themselves, and
the Foundation of their being the *Se-*
gullah, the *chosen People* and *peculiar*
Property of the *Supreme God* himself.
Undoubtedly the *Hellenists* did so under-
stand the passage in *Deuteronomy*, XXXII.
8. where *God* is said to have *set the*
bounds of the Nations, κατ' ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων
τῷ Θεῷ, as the LXXII read it. Accord-
ingly as they anciently reckoned LXXII
Nations in the *Greek*, Gen. X. so they
reckoned LXXII *Angels* President over
them, that is, so many *Chiliarchs* as
were in XII *Roman Legions* consisting
of six thousand each of them. And as
the present *Fews* reckon but LXX *Nati-*
ons, so they also allow LXX *Angels*. When
therefore immediately after the former
words, the *Sacred Writer* adds, *For*
the Lords portion is his people: Jacob is
the lot of his inheritance, Verse 9. Who
sees not how appositely this follows that
meaning of the former Verse in which
the LXXII understood it? Whereas
God had allotted *Angels* to the Govern-
ment of *other Nations*, he reserved *Israel*
for his *own lot*, and when he bounded
the

S. Hieron.
in Matth.
XXVI.

Vide Bo-
chart. Pha-
leg. I. 15.

Chap. 6. the inheritance of the *other Nations*, he marked out *Israel* for his own inheritance. Plainly he alludes to the way of dividing Inheritances by *lot*, which as in *Egypt* it was necessary for distinguishing their proportions after the inundation of *Nile*, so probably from thence the custom was also derived to other Countries where there was not the like necessity. Accordingly we find the Land of *Canaan* divided at first by *lot*, which the *Apostle* in the *Acts* calls κληροδοσίαν, and κληρο and *sors* are not only used synonymously in *Greek* and *Latine* Authors with *Inheritance*, but in the Language of the *Old Testament* also: so *David*:

Ps. XVI. 7. The lot is fallen unto me in a fair ground, yea I have a goodly heritage. And it is particularly the Language of the *Heathens* themselves, when they speak of this distribution of *Provinces* among their *Gods*. So they make the distribution of the *Heaven*, the *Sea*, and *Hell* between their three chief *Gods*, *Jupiter*, and *Neptune*, and *Pluto*, so they also make the distribution of the other *Provinces* and *Jurisdictions* among the *other Gods* also of the inferior *Orders*, and call the proportion of each by the name of λῆξις, μῶρις, *sors*, &c. So that this is

as

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 123

as accurately worded, as was possible, *Chap. 6.*
 for the sense of which I am at present
 discoursing. Considering therefore this
 fitness of the Connexion, methinks it
 should be no improbable conjecture, if
 I should conceive that instead of
 בני ישראל in the former Verse the an-
 cient Reading was בני אל, the Sons of
 God, as this name of *Sons of God* was
 in *Gen. VI. 2, 4.* as it was then under-
 stood by the *Hellenists* universally, and
 yet more confessedly in *Job I. 6. II. 1.*
XXXVIII. 7. ascribed to the *Angels.*
 The forementioned Translation of the
LXXII seems to imply that they found
 and understood it so in the *Ebrev* Copies
 of their Age. And the change was not
 difficult from אל to יל, which might al-
 so be mistaken for a contraction for
 יסעאל. An instance of this is com-
 monly observed in the pretended *Sancho-
 niathon.* Or if the change be rather
 deduced from a mistake of *El* for a
 final abbreviation of the word *Israel*:
 yet there are instances of Abbreviations
 as harsh as this among the *Massorites*,
 that none may wonder at this.

ACCORDINGLY after the *Sect. 5.*
 provocation of the *Golden Calf*, God
 threatens them with the condition of
 other

Chap. 6. other Nations, to perform his promise to them, and to drive the Nations of Canaan from before them; but not to do it in his own person, but by the Message of an Angel. *Exod. XXXII. 34. Therefore now go, lead the People unto the place of which I have spoken unto thee: Behold, mine Angel shall go before thee. XXXIII. 2, 3. And I will send an Angel before thee, and I will drive out the Canaanite, the Amorite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite: Unto a land flowing with milk and honey: For I will not go up in the midst of thee. Plainly God's sending his Angel with them is opposed to his going up with them in his own Person. This he had elsewhere threatened in case of their disobedience. Exod. XXIII. 20. And bids them beware of him, and obey his voice, and not to provoke him: for he would not pardon their iniquities, for his name was in him. What need was there of so many and so express Cautions in this matter, but because they who had been used to the Personal Conduct of God himself, might be apt to despise the Conduct of an Angel? He assures them that in that regard their condition should be rather worse, and their punishment more severe,*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 125

severe, in case of disobedience, that the Chap. 6.

Angel would be more concerned for *God's* dishonor, than *God* would be for his own. And why should he speak of the *Angels* punishing them, and not pardoning their *Iniquities*, unless he meant it of such a Power that the *Angel* should have over them as over other *Nations*, to punish or pardon at his own pleasure, not barely to execute the particular Commands of *God*, which had not been inconsistent with the continuation of the *Theocracy*. • The same *Angel* is elsewhere called the *Hornet*, *Exod.* XXIII. 28. *Deut.* VII. *Job.* XXIV. 12.

TO return therefore thither from Sect. 6. whence I have digressed, to shew that this was *God's* meaning in the forementioned place of *Exod.* XXXII, XXXIII. *God* thereupon denies them the name of his People: *Thy people* (says he to *Moses*) which thou broughtest out of the land of *Egypt*, &c. *Exod.* XXXII. 7. And again, Thou, and the people which thou hast brought up out of the land of *Egypt*, &c. XXXIII. 1. And so *Moses* understood it when he removed the *Tabernacle* without the *Camp*, afar off from the *Camp*, and called it the *Tabernacle* of the *Congregation*. The *Tabernacle* was a
Symbol

Chap. 6. *Symbol of God's Presence, and the removing of it did therefore plainly signify a removal of that special Presence which he had been pleased to shew among them; and the distance to which it was removed, as it signified the greatness of God's displeasure against them, so it signified withal the distance God intended hence forward to keep at from them, as far as it is possible for God to be distant, that is, in regard of that special presence of care and particular concernment which he had for them whilst he owned them as his People. So Moses understood it, and prays accordingly, Verse 15, 16. If thy presence go not with me, carry us not up hence. For wherein shall it be known here, that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us? So shall we be separated, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth. Plainly therefore his sending the Angel with them implied the withdrawing of his own presence from them. The presence so withdrawn was that whereby they were known to have found grace in his sight, that is, whereby they were known to be his peculiar Favourites; and that whereby the People of Israel*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 127

Israel were separated from all the People Chap. 6. that were upon the face of the earth. That is, wherein they were preferred before all other Nations. What is this but the very notion of their being the Segullah? That therefore must have consisted in this peculiar Presidency of God over them.

THE same appears from the *Prince of Persia* mentioned in *Dan. X. 13.* who is elsewhere called the *Watcher*, and the *holy One*, *Dan. IV. 13, 23.* This is the very name of these *Tutelar Demons* in the Book of *Enoch*, from whence we may well conclude the sense of that *Age* of the *Hellenists*, and of the *Primitive Christians*. The same may also be gathered from all those other places where God is called peculiarly the *God of Israel*, and they peculiarly *his People* and his *Inheritance*. I might shew that the *Jews* have always understood it so, not only the *Moderns*, who professedly make all other Nations subject to the *Angels*, and to *Fate*, but *themselves* only obnoxious to God, and mean this by their so much boasted Privilege of being the *Segullah*; but their ancient *Predecessors*, who always appropriate to *themselves* the worship of the *Supreme Being*, and that

Chap. 6. that *peculiar Providence* which results from his *particular care* of them, and own no *Nation* interested therein but *themselves*. I might shew that the first *Christians* understood it so from the *beginning*, both from their *Expositions* of the forementioned passage in *Deuteronomy*, and from the account they give generally from the Book of *Enoch*, how the *'Elympegi* which were *worshiped* by the *Heathens*, tho they were created *good* by *God*, and so were *good* when they were first *allotted* to their several *Charges*, yet afterwards they *fell* by their *pollution* with *Women*, and their assuming the *Titles* and *Honors* of *Gods* to themselves, derogating therein from the honor of him who had intrusted them. I have rather chosen to deduce all from the first *Fountains* from whence both the *ancient* and *modern Jews* and *Christians* first deduced them. This I know will signify more with that sort of *Adversaries* with whom I have to deal at present. Yet it being *actually* understood so by all those for whose *use* it was designed by the *Holy Ghost*, and to whose *capacities* his *expressions* were most designedly *fitted*; it is a great presumption that the *Holy Ghost* did at first

intend

Clem. Romanus.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 129

intend that it should be understood so. Chap. 6.

NOW tho it was their *Temporal In-* *Scēt. 8.*

terest that was first thought to be the Office of those *Tutelar Deities*, that was *prayed* for, and *expected*, from them by their respective *Nations* who owned and challenged a *Right* to their *Tuition* (for such things only their *publick Prayers* were generally made, and for such alone their *Thanksgivings* were generally returned) and therefore it was suitably *Temporal Benefits* which were also to be expected from the *God of Israel* in this capacity : yet even so it was a great condescension and benefit. It was an *ennobling* of the *Nation*, that *God* should undertake that for them in his *own Person*, which he did for others by his *Substitutes*. It was an Argument of a *Will* more favourable, and inclined to do Benefits for them, and an Argument to encourage them to *expect* Benefits from him with greater assurance, when he was pleased to exempt them from all *care* but his *own*. But besides the good will, the *Power* of such a Patron was also extremely desirable. The *Gods* of other *Nations* were only confined to *certain Powers* of doing Benefits for them ; but they knew they could *need* no

K

Benefit

Chap. 6. *Benefit* but what was in the *Power* of such a God to give them. They were confined to their *Countries* and *Provinces*; but no *distance* could exile them from the *Power* of him who made, and preserved, and governed the whole world. They might be overcome by other *Demons*, either absolutely more powerful, or, at least, more powerful in some particular *Cases*. They had power over their own *People*, but not over those other *Nations* and *Demons* that might hurt them. But this they were sure of who had the *Supreme Being* for their *Patron*, that nothing could befall them without his *Permission* and *Design*; that even the *Demons* of other *Nations* should be controlled and countermanded for their good; that therefore nothing could forfeit them their *happiness*, even in *this World*, but their own *Demerits*; that therefore when any *Calamity* befel them, they might assuredly conclude it was intended for their good; and that nothing could make it prove otherwise but their own *Perverseness*; that upon their *Repentance* they should more easily find acceptance as the greatest minds are most inclinable to pardon; that when the *Atonement* was made, and themselves disposed

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 131

disposed to make a *beneficial use* of their *Chap. 6.*
Restitution, no *Power* whatsoever should
be able to hinder it. These were *Privi-*
leges, even in regard of *this Life*, which
none could challenge but the *Worshippers*
of the *Supreme Deity*.

BUT if God had thus permitted the *Sect. 9.*
Nations to the *Government* of *Angels*,
where had then been the *Idolatry* of
worshipping those *Angels*? What *Sin* had
it been to have *desired* those things from
them which God had put in their *natu-*
ral Power; and of which he had made
them the allowed *Distributers*; or to
have returned them the *thanks* due for
favours so *received* upon such *Addresses*
to them? What had it been more than
to have desired the like favours from our
Fellow-Mortals, or to return them *thanks*
for kindnesses which cannot be denied
to be in their *natural Power*? But this
will not hinder but that 1. It had been
Idolatry, and a proper *robbing* the *Sup-*
reme Being of the Honor which was
actually due to him if the *Jews* his own
People had been guilty of any such
Addresses to any *Angels* or *Creatures*
whatsoever. For being assured that
God himself would undertake the care
of them in his own *Person*, they were
K 2 thereby

Chap. 6. thereby consequently assured, that no Benefits, how possible soever otherwise to *meer* Creatures, were *actually* to be expected from them, and that what Benefits were *actually* received, did not *actually* come from them. And to make *Addressees* to them for Benefits which not they, but the *Supreme Being* alone, must give them, if they were to be given at all; and to return *thanks* to them for favours not *actually* received from them, but from the *Supreme God*, this was plainly to rob him of so much of his *Honor* which was *actually* due to him, and to give that honor to his *Creatures*. This is the Case *actually* complained of by God, that when He, and He alone had *actually* given them *Corn* and *Wine*, they should notwithstanding return their acknowledgments to their *Idols*. AND 2. For

Sect. 10. the *Heathens* where they are *blamed* for their *Worship* in the *Old Testament*, it seems rather to have been on other accounts than barely for paying their *Acknowledgments* to the *Presets* placed over them by God. Such were their worshiping them by *Terrestrial Images*, to which they had no reason to believe them *present*; their worshiping them in the general Elements of *Nature* which were

Hof. II, 8.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 133

were *common* to all *mankind*, not proper *Chap. 6.* to the care of *particular Nations*; their worshipping them by Rites and Ceremonies *unworthy* of a Deity, such were the *Cruelties* of *Moloch*, and the *Uncleanesses* of *Succoth Benoth*, &c. Or lastly, their setting up these Lieutenants of God, in *opposition* to God himself; their *trusting* in the *Presidency* of their *Demons* for Victories to be gained over God's own People, and for *Deliverances* from *Judgments* to be inflicted on them by God himself in his *Peoples* Cause. This the *People* might be, and frequently were, guilty of, tho the *Demons* themselves, who were worshiped by them, had given them no cause, on account of that common popular mistake among them, whereby they took the *God* of *Israel* only for a *Tutelar Genius* of the common rank like their *own*, and one that might be *overpowered* by others. Otherwise where they payed their due Deference to the *Supreme Being*, as *Nebuchadnezzar* and *Cyrus*, there does not appear the least intimation of blame for their honoring their Country *Demons* in subordination to him. The Case of the *Cuthæans* is different, who were Inhabitants of the Country which be-
K 3 longed

Chap. 6. longed to his particular *Jurisdiction.*

Seet. 11. A ND 3. When these *Demons* were indeed *evil* ones, and were *known* to be so, and to be *Rebels* to the *Supreme Being*, then, no doubt, it was unlawful for any of *God's Creatures* to pay them any respect, or to have any thing to do with them. This was undoubtedly as obliging as all *Subjects* are obliged to desert and resist a *Lieutenant* otherwise lawfully empowered by him who had *Power* to constitute him, in case of *actual Rebellion* against him by whom he had been constituted. . And as far as they had any reason to believe them to be *evil* from the *Impurity* of the *Worship* required by them, so far they were, no doubt, obliged to detest them as *Enemies*. But this was not clearly and universally discovered till the times of the *Gospel*. As for the time wherein they were first deputed to this Office of being *Tutelars* to the *Nations*, the *Eyezees* in *Enoch* were as yet *innocent* when they were first intrusted by *God*. For these were not supposed to have fallen with *Lucifer* before the fall of *Man*, but afterwards when they polluted themselves with *Women*. From thence forward they challenged to themselves *Divine Honor*,
and

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 135

and instituted *Symbols* of Cruelty and Chap. 6.
Lust (which were the principal Vices
into which they then degenerated) and
intruded themselves into the *Statues* and
Sacrifices that were designed for purer Be-
ings. This I may the more confidently
rely on as a true account of this matter,
being it is that to which the Primitive
Apologists do constantly refer us in their
accounts of the *Original* of the *Worship*
of evil *Spirits*, derived by them also
from the *Doctrines* and *Traditions* of the
Hellenists, from whose *Notions* that
Book of *Enoch* was exactly calculated.
The only prejudice against it at present
is the pure *incorporeal nature* of all sorts
of *Devils*. But neither is there any ne-
cessity, on a Philosophical Account,
that this *Doctrine* should be true; and it
was certainly no popular *received Do-*
ctrine in that *Age*, and therefore can be
no competent *Standard* for judging con-
cerning the *Orthodoxy* of other *Do-*
ctrines of those times.

IT may also be objected on the other Side 12.
side, that God did not so assume to him-
self the *immediate Care* of the *Jews* but
that he also made use of the *ministry* of
Angels in managing it. And the *New*
Testament it self gives this account of it,

Chap. 6. and lays great stress upon it in its Reasonings for the Preeminence of the Gospel above the Law of Moses. It is said to be an

(a) Act. Angel that spoke (a) to Moses in the Bush, & VII. 30, 35. the Law is said to have been (b) given by (b) Ib. v. 53. the disposition of Angels; from whence

(c) Heb. 11. 2, 3.

(d) Heb. 1. 4.

it is that the Apostle (c) infers the Dignity of the Gospel above the Law, because our Savior by whom the Gospel is delivered, has a (d) more honorable name given him than those Angels, not now to mention the Angel of Abraham, Gen. XXIV. 7. nor the Angel of Jacob Gen. XLVIII. 16. nor the Angel of Gods Presence, Is. LXIII. 9. There is no doubt but God did then, and still does perform many good offices for his People, by the ministry of Angels. But there is a great difference between committing to their general care, as Prefects of Provinces, which still leaves particular Benefits to their Arbitrary distribution, and between a service of Satellites, where nothing is left arbitrary, but the whole Service is determined by him who employs them without asking their consent. The former does indeed leave some ground for addresses and Thanks for Benefits left to their arbitrary distribution, and of that kind the Power of the

ἐνδύαξα

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 137

ἐθνάρχει and πολιῆται δαίμονες, as *Fuli-Chap. 6.*
 an the *Apostate* calls them, seems to
 have been, in the sense also of these *Hel-* Apud cy.
lenistical Jews and *Christians*, who al- ril. Al.
 lowed such *Prefects* over the *Gentile*
Nations. They allowed them a Power
 of doing good to their *Subjects*, and of
punishing their contempts and neg-
 lects of Religion, and an earnest con-
 cernment for their several respective
 charges. Else there had been no rea-
 son to speak of *Fightings* between them,
 as in the Book of *Daniel*, or of some be-
 ing worsted and others being victorious,
 if each of them had been determined
 in every particular act of his Office by
 an exprefs command of God. As for
 the *Angels* employed in the concern-
 ments of the *Jews*, and those which
 are still commanded on the like Offices
 for the *Heirs* (1) of *Salvation*, they
 are plainly spoken of as *λαϊσάρχαι* (1) Heb. I.
πρόμαχοι, as the *Angels* of (2) his 14.
Presence, as part of the *Train* (3) of God, (2) Isaiah
 like the *Satellites* and *δευφότες* of *Prin-* LXIII. 9.
ces, to whom no *Addresses* are made or (3) II. VI. 1.
Thanks thought due for Services per-
 formed by them in obedience to the
 particular exprefs commands of their
 several *Princes*. This seems plainly
 the

Chap. 6. the Case of those *Angels* who deliver these messages, not in their own names, but the *Name* of *God*, and are accordingly also styled by his *incommunicable Name*, which no *Creature* could or durst take on its *own* account. I think there are hardly any *Angels* mentioned as employed on that account, but the *Jews* themselves, when they are either named in the *Scriptures* themselves, or when they venture, from their conjectural Traditions, to determine who they were, reckon them among the *Seven* which they make continual attendants on the *Majestatick Presence* of their Maker. The difference of these cases is very manifest even in the Practice of Earthly *Princes*. They also usually govern the Province of their *Residence* in *Person*, yet not so but that they employ *others* even there for the *Servile* parts of the Government. Yet the Persons so employed are not so empowered as to cut off ordinary *Addresses* to their Persons, as the *Prefects* of *Provinces* are who are at a greater distance.

Sect. 13. YET I am not so concerned, whether this distinction of the *Segullah* were so originally *designed* by *God*, as that
he

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 139

he never *intended* any further Provi- Chap. 6.
dence for *other Nations* beyond the
Provision of *Provincial Angels*. Whe-
ther it was by Gods *Original Intention*,
on their own *demerits*; yet it was *actu-*
ally so, that God did not so *particularly*
take care of the *Temporal Government*
and *Prosperity* of any *other Nation* as
he did for *Israel*, God was not so high
any others as he was to them, he had not
dealt so with any other Nation, neither
had the heathen knowledge of his Laws;
and that this was the great *Priviledg*
wherein they gloryed on the account of
their pretensions to be the *Segullah*.
They had particular pretensions to
Gods favor above others on account of
the *Promises* made to their *Forefathers*,
on account of the *particular Cove-*
nant he made with *them*, That He
would be their *God* and that they
should be his *People*, on account of the
Laws he had given them, of the *Tab-*
ernacle and *Temple* he had accepted as
designing a more peculiar Ordinary
Residence among them, of the *Succeſſion*
of *Prophets* and *Urim*, and other ways he
had instituted of being consulted by them
on occasional emergencies, in regard
of the *Shubinah*, those ordinary mani-
festations

Chap. 6. festations of his presence among them, the *Cloud*, and the *Pillar* of fire in the Wilderness, and the *glory* that shadowed the mercy Seat during the whole time of the *first Temple*, in regard of that particular care he took to raise them *Deliverers*, and to give them *victories* in the times of their necessities, in punishing and rewarding *other Nations* as they proved good or inhumane to them, and giving *other Nations* for their *ransome*, and doing so great things for them in the sight of the World, that in them *all the Nations of the World* should be blessed, that is, that all other Nations should wish that all those to whom they wished well, might be treated as *they* were (for so I understand that primary meaning of these words) and in securing these happinesses to them, so by his *Promises* and his *Covenant*, that nothing could possibly drive them off them but their *own Sins*. If *God* did concern himself for *other Nations* in his *own Person*, yet these were *peculiar* favors which *Israel* enjoyed, and could *challenge* by virtue of their *Covenant*, and which no other Nation could *challenge* but *they*. In these regards therefore which are very considerable
and

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 141

and beneficial, it cannot be denyed but *Chap. 6.*
that the *God of Israel* was properly the
God of Israel as the *other Gods* of their
respective *Nations*. Besides this, Ap-
propriation is most clearly signified in
that Title of a *Husband* so frequently as-
cribed to *God* in the Prophets, especially
as the same Allegory is continued by
them in the *Consequences* of that Title. On
this account his *Peoples* leaving him
is called *Whoredom*, and his receiving
the *Gentiles* into their *Priviledges* is
called a giving them a *Bill of divorce*,
and a provoking them to *jealousy*.
How could this be if the *Appropriation*
had not been mutual? How had it been
whoredom in them to follow *other Gods*
if they had not been obliged to him
alone for their *God* as a *Wife* is to her
Husband? How had his receiving the
Gentiles, been called a provoking them
to *Jealousy*, if it had not been a shewing
the *Gentiles* that favour which as a *Wife*,
they had thought *proper* to themselves.

CHAP.

* C H A P. VII.

The way of Appropriating a God (according to the Customes of those Times) was by Sacrifices received in One Place, and from One Altar, and One High Priest.

The CONTENTS.

2. *The way of appropriating a God to a Nation was by Sacrifice. Sect. I. The Popular Sacrifices were to be considered as Ceremonies of Covenanting and particularly of Covenanting with their Gods as well as with one another. Sect. II. These Sacrifices were confined to particular Nations. Sect. III. Especially their Mysteries. Sect. IV. The most Ancient Sacrifices were generally thus confined. Sect. V. How this was consistent with the Heathens permitting the Worship of the Gods of other Nations besides their own. Sect. VI. The Covenanting Symbols of Unity that were used in their*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 143

their Common Sacrifices. Sect. VII, Chap. 7.

VIII. *The Sacrifices were also Natural Means of promoting this Unity of the Sacrificers with their Gods.*

Sect. IX. *The Consequences following hereupon. Sect. X.*

3. *The National Panegyres or Assemblies for participating in those National Sacrifices confined to a certain place Sect. XI. Moses very probably alluded herein to the Practices of the Egyptians. Sect. XII.*

4. *In the Panegyres so fixed, All the Sacrifices then feasted on were to be received from One Altar. Sect. XIII. The Reason. Sect. XIV.*

5. *The Affairs of that One Altar always, managed by One chief Priest. Sect. XV.*

2. **T**HEREFORE it is to be observed further that *the way of appropriating a God to a Nation was by Sacrifice.* Sect. I. I am not now concerned whether *Sacrifices were introduced by Primary Institution.* It suffices for my purpose that they were taken up by God from the practices already obtaining among the Heathens, as several of the Ancients conceive, who

Chap. 7. who deny any *Prim* approbation of them. If they were taken up on *this account*, the Argument will hold more strongly for my purpose. For if they were not taken up for their *own sake*, then it plainly follows that there could be no other design in admitting them but that they might perform the same Office to the *Israelites*, as they had to other *Nations* which had received them before. And therefore if the design of them *before* was a *mutual appropriation* of a *God* to a *Nation*, and of a *Nation* to a *God*; this, and this alone, can be understood to be the design of them as used also among the *Israelites*. Yet the *Reasoning* will also hold on the other *Hypothesis*. For if they had been taken upon *particular approbation*, yet considering that the main use of them consists in their *signification*, the common justice of *Converse* will require that, being *signs of common use*, they should be intended in the *common* notorious *signification*. There was reason to presume that they would be so understood by them to whom they were used, and there had been indeed no reason to guide them to expound them *otherwise*. As therefore the *justice of dealing* requires

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 145

quires that Persons conversing do de- Chap. 7.
sign to be *rightly understood* by those
with whom they deal; so the same
justice, in order to the same *designs*, re-
quires that what significations of their
mind shall be made use of, be un-
derstood the same way as it is known
that the Persons dealt with *will*, and
will have *reason* to understand them.
These common Rules of *Equity* in *deal-*
ing are used and appealed to for a
justification of his own dealing by God
himself. It remains therefore that I
shew that this was the *design* of *Sacrifices*
among the *Heathens*, to appropriate a
Nation to the *Care* of a particular *Da-*
mon, so that they who were admitted
to such *Sacrifices* might challenge an
interest in the *Demons* *Care*, and they
who had no *Right* to be admitted to the
Sacrifices should be also supposed to have
no *Right* to that *Care* and *Protection* of
the *Damon*, and they who were ex-
cluded from the *Sacrifices*, should also
be judged *excluded* from that *Pro-*
tection.

This appears from the most ancient *Sect. 2.*
use and *design* of *Sacrifices* as Ceremo-
nies of entering into *Covenant*. This
appears even from *Homer* who constant-

L

ly

Chap. 7. ly makes this the way of ratifying all *Leagues* and *Truces*, and such things wherein it was requisite that *Faith* should be obliged. And as all *Covenants* were with *Oaths*, and those *Oaths* with *Imprecations* in case of *violation*, so these *Sacrifices* were purposely designed to signify the devoting their own *Lives* like that of the *Beast*, if they should break their word, and they made choice of *Sacred Rites* and *Religious* for this purpose, that the *Gods* might engage for the *punishment* of the offender if he should, through *subtilty* or might, prove too powerful for *Humane Justice*. This Custom therefore of making *Covenants* with *Sacrifice*, was taken from the *Practices* of *Men* into use in *Covenanting* with the *Gods* themselves. And tho it be certain that the whole design of *Ordinary Sacrifices* was not for making *new Covenants* as often as they *Sacrificed*, yet they were all for maintaining that *Commerce* and *Conversation* with the *Deities* which were first grounded on the *Covenant* it self. By the *first Covenant* they were *united* to their *Gods*. Accordingly the *Idolatrous Israelites* are said to have *joyned themselves* to *Baal Peor*, ἐτελέσθων is the word in the LXXII,

Selden in
Marm.
Arund.

Num.
XXV. 3. 5.
Psal. CVI.
28.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 147

LXXII, because it was indeed in these *Chap. 7.*

that the *Covenants* were properly made, and wherein this Discipline was most strictly observed. And from hence followed a *Right* to the other *Sacrifices*, whence it is that the Apostle makes a partaking in the Devils *Sacrifices* to be a communicating with the Devils themselves, 1 Cor. X. 20. the same way as communicating with our *Eucharistical Mystical Sacrifices* is communicating with our *Saviour*, Verse 21.

This *Covenant* therefore of the Gods *Sect. 3.* with *Nations* was confined to the *Nations* with which the *Covenants* were made, so that no other *Nation* had a *Right* to partake in the *Sacred Privileges* of others. When *Hercules* designed the fetching of *Cerberus* out of *Hell*, having heard of how great efficacy the *Mysteries* were accounted for passing into the other *World*, he applies himself to *Eumolpus* for his initiation into them, but could not gain the favor till he was first adopted by *Pylus*. The reason is expressly given, *ὡς ὅτι ἔξωθεν ἔειπας τὰ μυστήρια*, and these *Mysteries* were in *Attica*, so that *Hercules* must first be made an *Athenian* before he could be admitted to them, as the *Jews* also received *Gentiles*

Apollodorus.
Bibl. L. II.
Sect. 12.
Plutarch.
Theop. p. 16.
Scholias.
Hom. II.
Θ. v. 368.
Schol. Ari-
stoph. in
Plin.

Chap. 7. into their Nation by *Profelytism*. So the *Dioscouri* were also adopted by *Aphydnus* on the same design of *initiation*.

Plutarch.

Thef. ib.

Meurf. El-

cufin. c. 19.

And this is the very reason insisted on by *Julian* the Apostate, for excusing *Diogenes* from the accusation of *Impiety* in refusing to be *initiated*, that he could not be admitted without an *Adoption* into the City of the *Athenians*. For he was not born *there*, but at *Sinope*. This he takes to have been inconsistent with his larger profession of being a *Citizen* of the whole world. So he: συνεὶς ὅπ

Julian. O-

rat VII.

ad Heracl.

Cynic. de

Seft. cynic.

v. 441.

442. Edit.

Pitavii.

τ' μὲν μὲν ἔχει πᾶσι τοῖς ἀφ' ὧν περὶ τὸν
 καὶ Ἀθηνᾶσιν, εἰ καὶ μὴ φύσει, τὰ νόμῳ ὅτι ἔχουσιν
 τὸ ἐφύλῳ, καὶ τὸ μνησθῆναι νομίζων αὐτὸν
 εἶναι τὸν κόσμον πολίτην. That *Bacchus*
 also and *Æsculapius* and *Hippocrates*
 were *initiated*, was by a particular fa-
 vor for so highly valued Persons. That
 however they intended *originally* to ex-
 clude all that were not of their *own Na-*
tion, appears from the form alluded to
 in *Theon Smyrnaus*, which I am apt to
 think he might have had from the
 ἀνάγκης of the κῆρυξ himself. These
 are his words, οὐτε γὰρ ἅπανσι τοῖς βε-
 λομήτοις μέγιστα μυστηρίων ὄντων, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν καὶ
 αὐτῶν εἰσάγειν προσηγορεύεται: οἷον τὰς
 χεῖρας

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 149

χέρας μὴ καὶ χέρας, ἢ φωνῶν ἀξύνετον *Chap. 7.*
 ἔχοντας. Their forbidding *Barbarians* is *Isocr. in Pa-*

mentioned expressly by *Isocrates* and *Lu-*
negyr.
Lucian. De-
mon.

cian, no doubt intended by this very ex-
 pression of an *unknown Tongue*. It is
 the Character of a *Barbarian* in *S. Paul*
 himself, *If I know not the meaning of the*
voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a
Barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be
a Barbarian unto me, 1 Cor. XIV. 11.

Isocrates will have this first introduced
 in opposition to the *Persians* in resent-
 ment of their invasion, but it appears
 there was no need of any such resent-
 ment for it, when it was so agreeable to
 their *Original Constitutions*, that even
Hercules and the *Dioscuri*, *Bacchus* and
Æsculapius and *Hippocrates*, tho *Greci-*
ans by extraction, could not be admitted
 without *Incorporation*. If therefore this

were the Original Form, then we see it
 so severely interpreted as that even the
 difference of a *Dialect* was comprehen-
 ded under the φωνῶν ἀξύνετον. The *diffe-*
rence was no *greater* between them and

the other *Grecians*. So it is also under-
 stood by *Æschylus*, who calls the *Ar-*
give Army under *Adrastus* against
Thebes, ἐπεὶ φωνῶν σφραγισμένων. This will

also give light to that expres-
 sion

Chap. 7. fion of the *Prophet* where *God* threatens his *People*, that he would provoke them with a *People of another Tongue*, that is, by admitting others to their *Privileges*, that were *Barbarians* to them, that is, Persons of another *Nation*, the same thing that he had elsewhere threatened them, to provoke them to jealousy by a people that were no people, and by a foolish nation. Nay so far were they from admitting persons of another *Nation* to their *Mysteries*, as that it was *Piacular* and *Capital* for any such to be found so much as in their *Temples* whilst any such *Rite* was performing. There is a remarkable story in *Livy* to this purpose: Two *Acaranian* Youths uninitiated came into the *Temple* of *Ceres*, ignorantly, but at their going out discovered themselves by some impertinent Questions, being unskilful in the worship there performed. Being discovered, they were carried before the *Priests*, and were put to death for the *Prophanation*, tho it appeared that they came in without any ill design. And as none other *Nations* might be admitted to their *Sacrifices*, so neither were they thought to have any *Right* in their *Prayers*: so *Philo* expressly: οἱ μὲν ἅλλαν οἱ ἱερεῖς

Isaiah

XXVIII.

11.

1 Co. XIV.

21.

Deuter on.

XXXII.

21.

Rom. X.

19.

Liv. Lib.

XXXII.

c. 14.

ὑπερ

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 151

ὑπὲρ οἰκείων καὶ φίλων καὶ ΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ αὐτοῦ *Chap. 7.*

μόνον εἰώδασι τὰς τ' εὐχὰς καὶ θυσίας ὁρῶντε.

λεῖν. He adds indeed, that the *Jewish*

High Priest did represent and make *inter-*

cession for the whole *World*. But this

could not possibly be understood con-

cerning such things as were proper to

themselves as the *Segullah*, such as were

the Promises of the Land of *Canaan* Li-

terally, and of *Heaven* as *mystically* pro-

mitted also under those *mystical* *Represent-*

tations. But as these *Prayers* for other

Nations seem to have been first introdu-

ced after their *dispersion* into other Coun-

tries (I do not remember the least inti-

mation of it in any of the *Psalms* that

were *ancienter* than the *Captivity*, nor

in any of the other *ancienter* Devotions

which occur *occasionally* in the other Hi-

storical Books of the Old Testament ;)

so possibly the design of such *Prayers*

and *Sacrifices* might have been for those

of their *own Nation* alone who were, by

this time, dispersed into most Countries

upon *Colonies* ; and this the rather be-

cause they were *incorporated* into most of

the *Cities* into which such *Colonies* had

been deduced by the favor of the *Mace-*

donian Founders, and the Indulgence

of the *Roman* Conquerors, which *In-*

Chap. 7. corporation made them accounted as parts of those Nations into which they had been incorporated. Thus Trypho understood the Prophecies concerning the Conversions of the Nations. Or if they were pleased to include native Gentiles themselves, yet they might have been those Profelytes which were dayly brought over by the Jews conversing with them to some degree of Profelytism; if not that of Justice (which made them no longer reputed Gentiles) at least that of the Gates, which was consistent with their Gentilism. The History of the New Testament assures us that there were very considerable numbers of such Converts, and that from every Nation under Heaven, and these they did admit to an inferior portion in their Prayers. Witness that part of the Temple purposely allotted for them called the Court of the Gentiles, and their coming up to worship at the Solemn Panegyres. Or if yet further they admitted any Prayers for Gentiles still persisting in their Gentile Distinctives, and Gentile Religions; yet even so the reason was not for the Gentiles themselves any further than as the Jewish Interests were so involved with theirs as that the Jewish affairs

Ap. Justin.
Mart. in
Dialog.

A& II. 5.

S. Job. XII.
30.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 153

affairs could not be prosperous, unless *Chap. 7.*
those greater *Bodies*, of which them-
selves were the less considerable parts,
were *prosperous* also. This is the reason
given by the *Prophet* why they were to
pray to God for the Cities whither they
should be carried *Captive*, for in the
peace thereof shall ye have peace. And
this was the case of those who were *Jeremiah*
Inhabitants of the *Colonies*, and of all *XXIX. 7.*
of them when *Subjects* to *Gentile* Prin-
ces. On this account, and this alone,
they *sacrificed* for the *Persian* Kings and
the *Roman* Emperors, when they were
verily perswaded that it was God's
pleasure to give them up to that slavery,
tho even so the *Zealots* made all the op-
position they could against it. Yet after
all, considering that the *God* owned by
themselves was the common *Creator* and
Governor of all *other Nations* as well
as themselves; and that thereupon it
followed that he must have had an *obli-*
gation from his own beneficent *nature* as
well to do them *good*, as he had an
unalienable *Right* to *govern* them; and
that no substitution of *Prefects* is ever
thought sufficient to hinder the imme-
diate interposition of a *Prince*, when he
is pleased to command a kindness for
his

Chap. 7. his *Provincial Subjects*: It cannot therefore be thought strange that such favors as were not derogatory to the *Properties* reserved for the *Peculiar* People should be desired for *other Nations* also, especially if those general Terms of *all mankind*, and the *whole world*, be understood in the usual limitation of those Phrases in that *Age*, so as to extend no further than the *Roman Empire*. So far they were *obliged* to pray for them on the account now mentioned of their own *Interest*. And so far they were imitated by the *Primitive Christians*, who prayed for their *Heathen Emperors* when they were not engaged in actual *Persecution*, and for a *quiet world*, that is for the *Peace* of the *Roman Empire*, tho otherwise their *Prayers* were (as I have elsewhere shewn) confined to the *visible Members* of the *Orthodox Communion*. However it is otherwise certain that the now mentioned passages of *Philo* must not be understood so as to hinder the *confinement* of their ordinary *Sacrifices* to their own *Nation*.

Separat.
proved
Schismatic.
Sect. 4.

THUS it was in their *Mysteries*, which because of their great *Sacredness*, and the horror they had of innovating any thing concerning *them*, kept longest
to

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 155

to their *Original Discipline*. And it *Chap. 7.*
 was from their *Initia* that they derived
 their *Right* of partaking in their *Sacri-*
fices. In the instance last mentioned
 we see it was *Piacular* for Persons *un-*
initiated so much as to be present at
 their *Worship*. How much less then
 must it have been *lawful* for them to
partake of the *Sacrifices*. We see there-
 fore that it was agreeable to the com-
 mon usages of that kind, when the *Jews*
 counted it a *prophanation* of their *Tem-*
ple, whenever the *Gentiles* proceeded
 into the *Holy Place*. So they did in the
 Case of *Antiochus* and *Pompey*. And so
 they did in the supposed Case of *S. Paul*,
 when they thought he had brought *Tro-*
phimus the *Ephesian* into it, pretending
 thereupon that he had *polluted* the *holy*
place. As for the place allowed to the
Gentiles, the *outer Court*, it is commonly
 observed from the employment they put
 it to, in trading for their *Sacrifices*, that
 they did not account it *holy*. And in-
 deed how could they count them *holy*
 enough to partake of their *holy things*,
 when the strict ones among them count-
 ed it a *Legal Pollution* so much as to *touch*
 them, or to *converse* with them in pub-
 lick places, and when they would not so
 much

Joseph.

AR. XX.
28, 29.

Chap. 7. much as eat with them? *S. Peter* when
Gal. II. 12. the *Jews* came from *Jerusalem*, was fain
 to separate from eating with the *Gentiles*
 to preserve the good opinion of his
 Countrymen. They who took it
 for a pollution to partake with them
 in their common meals, how much
 more must they have thought it so,
 to have admitted them to any sacred
 Commerce? Upon this account it can-
 not be thought strange that the *Jews*
 rejected the *Cuthaans* from any hand in
 building the Temple with them, notwith-
 standing that they professed to worship
 the God of *Israel*. They tell them, that
 they had nothing to do to build an House
 to their God. *Ezr. IV. 3.* What can be a
 clearer Argument of this Appropriation
 than this, that, they were not permit-
 ted so much as to assist in building an
 House to their God, without complete
 Profelytism? This was plainly an Ap-
 propriation of their God, and their Altar.

Sect. 5. FOR tho, for the reason now given,
 the Case were clearer in the *Heathens*
 that they did appropriate their Mysteries
 to Persons of their own Nation; yet
 there are not wanting great Presumpti-
 ons that Originally, before Conquest, and
 Servile compliances, had broken all their
 Rules,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 157

Rules, it was intended that their *Sacrifices* should be proper also, and their *Plays* and all their great *Festivals*. Thus

Chap. 7.

in the *Olympicks*, none but *Greeks* were permitted to have any part, and in the *Panionia* none but the *Ionians*. And

this keeping to their *Country Gods* was so constantly kept to, even when they

went on *Colonies*, and accordingly the *Colonies* still reserved an honorable place for those of their *Mother Cities* in their *Sacred Rites*, as ap-

pears in the Case of *Corcyra* and *Corinth*

in *Thucydides*; and on the contrary the

Lib. I.

Metropolis also received those of their *Colonies* to theirs at home as all the

Grecian Colonies of *Sicily* and *Magna Græcia* in *Italy* were permitted to strive

in the *Græcian Olympicks*. Thus it was that their *Citizens*, however dispersed,

still kept up a memory of their *affinity*: and there was no certainer *Argument*,

those many ancient *Geographers*, who wrote concerning *Colonies*, had to prove

the *Relations Cities* had to each other; than this of the *Community* of their

Religions, and the correspondence maintained between them in their *Sacrifices*, which could have been no *Ar-*

gument, if the *Right* of their *Sacrifices* had

had

Chap. 7. had not been thought proper to the re-
 spective Nations. Hence those strict
 Injunctions of wisemen every where
 among them, obliging all to worship
 their Country Gods, and in the way of
 their Countries. This seems to be the
 meaning of the ἐννομία ἐξέζων in the *Golden*
verses, and was imitated, as other
 things of the *Pythagoreans* were, by
Plato. So *Socrates*, being asked whether
 it was lawful to worship the Gods as they
 pleased, denies it, but confines them to the
 Laws of their Country ἀλλὰ νόμοι εἰσι καὶ
 εἰς αὐτοὺς τὸ τοιοῦτον ποιεῖν. And it was one of the
 Fundamental Constitutions of the *A-*
thenians from the time of *Draco* one of
 their most ancient Law-givers: θεομὸς
 αἰώνιος τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις νομομένης καὶ
 ἀπὸ πάντων λαόνων, θεὸς πᾶν καὶ ἥρωας
 ἑταίριον ἐν κοινῷ, ἐπομνηστικῶς νόμοις.
 ΠΑΤΡΙΟΙΣ, &c. And one of the
 Oaths which the *Athenian* youths were
 in obliged to take, was ἡεὶ τὰ πατέρα
 τιμῶ, as we have the form of the Oath
 in *Stobæus*. Nor was this only the sense
 of their wisemen and Legislators, but
 even of their Gods themselves. *A-*
pollo is quoted for it by *Socrates* in *Xeno-*
phon, as if he always gave it as an
 Answer to all that consulted him how
 they should serve the Gods most accep-
 tably?

Aur. Car.
 Pythag.
 v. 3.

Ap. Xenoph.
 Mem. IV.

Ap. Porph.
 de Abst. L.
 IV. § 22.

Stob. Serm.
 XLI. Ed.
 Gesner.
 περὶ Πο-
 λιτείας
 Tigur.
 1453. p.
 252.

Oem. 77
 Ἀθην.
 ἐφύζων.

Ap. Xeno-
 phon. Mem.
 IV. & ap.
 Cicero. de
 Legib. II.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 159

tably ? that they should do it νόμῳ πόλεως. Chap. 7.

And Aristotle says that not only He, but all other Oracles, required it, that they should τὰ ΠΑΤΡΙΑ ποιεῖσθαι τοὺς θυσίας.

Aristot.
Rhetor. ad
Alexandr.

Accordingly it was a punishable crime not only among the Jews, but among the Heathens also, to introduce new Religions. Among the Athenians the Areopagites were the Court in which they were to be tryed who offended in this kind. This was the Accusation against

Ap. Laert.
L. II. in So-
crat. Xen-
oph. Mem.
1 Plat. A-
pol. Socr.
1 Isocr. En-
com. Bu-
siris. Just.
Martyr.
Parzn.

Socrates: Ἀδελφοὶ Σωκράτης, ὅς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεῶς ὁ νομίζων, ἕτερον ὃ καὶ νῦν δαίμονι ἐισπύσμενος, that we may not wonder that St. Paul also was accused before that same Judicatory in the same form, that he was ξένων δαίμονιων καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν, because he Preached to them Je-

sus and the Resurrection, whom they took for another Demon called Anastasis. At Rome also the Bacchanalia, being introduced secretly by some Greeks were suppressed by order from the Senate. And in this regard it is very true that the receiving or excluding new Religions was indeed the Privilege of the Senate, and the Government, and forbidden private Persons by the Laws of the XII. Tables. Thus was the worship of Isis excluded out of Rome

Liv. 39.
c. 8, &c.
Vide Gu-
th. et. de
Jur. Pont.
1. 34.
Ap. Cicero.
de Leg. II.

by

Chap. 7. by *Tiberius*. Thus was the worship of *Christ* excluded out of *Rome* by order of the *Senate*, when *Tiberius* referred it to them, whether it should be received, if the Story in *Tertullian* to this purpose be true. And thus were the Emperors Canonized, after that Custom also grew fashionable. Seeing therefore they were all obliged to worship the *Demons* of their *Country*; seeing there were *Laws* made against *Innovations* in *Religion*; both these put together will plainly amount to the *Appropriations* of *Deities* designed to be proved by us.

Sect. 6. FOR tho, with the leave of the *Government*, they might introduce new *Religions*, yet is not this any Argument against the confinement I am speaking of. Those *Gods* were thought to be *such*, as that *many* of them might have the *care* of the same *Nation* in different, or subordinate regards. And as they supposed each of them to have his *Province* allotted him by the assignation of the *Supreme Being*, so they also thought that their *Provinces* might be *changed* or *enlarged* by *consent* of the *Demons* themselves, or by *assignation* of the *Supreme* who was their common

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 161

mon Superior. But this reason did Chap. 7.
not reach the *God* of the *Jews*, who
being the *Supreme*, and being alone
sufficient for all the necessities of his
People needed no other *Coadjutor*
within his own charge; and it was not
agreeable with the Rules of Majesty to
have a *Provincial* in the Jurisdiction
of his own *Residence*; and being the
Supreme himself he could not have a
co-partner joyned with him without
his own *consent*, which, upon all occa-
sions, he expressly *refused*. But as they
had other *conceptions* concerning their
own Deities, so their *Practices* in re-
ceiving them were *suitable* to those con-
ceptions. Whenever they received any,
it was not of their own arbitrary plea-
sure, but from some pretended *Signi-*
fication of the *minds* of the *Gods* them-
selves that it should be so. So was the
Mother of the *Gods* and *Æsculapius*
received upon *Oracles* which were sup-
posed to *Signify* the *mind* of the *Supreme*
Being himself, not of any one *particular*
Demon. For none else was thought
to be the general disposer of events
concerning so many and so different
Nations but *he*. Others were reciv-
ed on *particular Revelations* attested by

M

such

Chap. 7. such witnesses as were supposed credible, as *Romulus* under the name of *Quirinus*, upon the *Oath* of *Iulius Proculus* which also afterwards were taken in course for the *Canonization* of the *Emperours*. Others by the Apparition of *Stars*, which were above the disposal of the *Provincial Demons*, and could onely therefore be thought to signify the mind of him that was *Supreme*. So the *Fulium Sidus* was the ground of the *Canonization* of *Fulius Caesar*. Others were with *charms* drawn out of the *Cities* whose *Tutelars* they were, and invited to *Rome* with promises of *Temples*, which as it was supposed to be with the *consent* of the *Demons* so *enchanted*, who of their own free wills were supposed to *accept* of the proffers made to them together with the nobler office of being *Tutelar* to the *Conquerours*; so neither could it be to the *disinterest* of their own *Tutelars* whose *Power* was by that means enlarged. This seems to have been the occasion of most of those *temples* of *strange Gods* in *Rome*. For it seems to have been an ancient & common *Custom* among them, if we may believe *Sammonicus Serenus* an *Author* of *Antoninus Caracalla's* time, who

Macrob.
Saturnal.
III. 9.

Ap. Macro.
ib.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 163

who yet has it from one *Furius* whom Chap. 7.
 he thought then very ancient. Several
 Towns of *Italy* are there mentioned as
 so taken, besides *Carthage* and *Corinth*,
 out of it. And as perhaps no place
 was more guilty than *Rome* in this par-
 ticular of the worship of *strange Gods*,
 so they are particularly upbraided
 by St. *Augustine*, that very many of
 the Gods they worshiped were Captive
 ones, which again makes it very pro- De Ciu.
 bable that this was the *Original* of their Dei.
 worshipping of them. And this was
 counted a more civil way of treating
 those *captive Gods* themselves, than if they
 had pretended bluntly, as the *Heathens*
 about *Palastine*, that the *Deities* of the
Conquerors were more potent than those
 of the *Nations* conquered by them.

AND as all *Covenants* were in those Sect. 7.
 times made with *Sacrifice*, so all *Sacri-*
fices, besides those of the *Mysteries*,
 included also something of a *Covenant*.
 This appears from the use of those things
 in *ordinary Sacrifices* which were then
 thought of the strictest signification
 of *union*. *Salt* was the Embleme of
 the strictest *Union* among them, and
 there was nothing counted more pia-
 cular than to prove false after having
 M 2 participated

Chap. 7. participated in their *κοινὸν ἅλς*, and an unalterable unviolable Covenant is in the *Scripture* filed a *Covenant of Salt*. And accordingly *salt* was, in their ordinary entertainments, consecrated to their *Hospital Gods*, that it might be taken for an affront to them if any breach should fall out afterwards. Now this was used in all *Sacrifices*; every *Sacrifice* was *Sacrificed* with the *Salt*. So the *Scriptures* concerning the general customs of the *Sacrifices* of those Countries where the *Sacred writers* lived. And the same Custom was also observed by the *Greeks* and *Romans* as appears by the *ἁλοχύται* of the one and the *falsa fruges* or *mola falsa* of the other.

Vide *Plin.*
N. H.
XXXI. 7.
S. Mark
IX 49.
Lev. II. 13.

S. 7. 8.

OF the same signification it was to partake in *Bread* and *Meat*. The *Sacreddest* bond among Mankind was that of *Marriage*, and the *Sacreddest Marriage* that of *Confarreation*. Now this was the *mola* so constantly used in all *Sacrifices* as that the name of *Immolation* was used for *Sacrificing* it self. And of this kind was the *Greek ἁλοχύται* and the *Ebrev Meat Offering*. So was it also to *drink* to one another and to partake of the same *Cup*. And the *Libation* always went together with the *Sacrifice*.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 165

fice. So also it was to *feast* together, Chap. 7. as we see in the *Covenant* of *Jacob* and *Laban* Gen. XXXI. 54. in which regard their *partaking* of the same *Sacrifices* was a confederating them to one another. But it was also a confederating them to the *Deity*. For this was also a custom among the ancients for *superiors* at entertainments to signify their favour to their *Inferiors* by cutting them out *Portions* of the meat that was before them. Thus it is that *Agamemnon* in *Homer* puts the *Heroes* in mind of the particular respect he had shewed them by the *Proportions* he had carved for them at their solemn entertainments. And thus *Joseph* shews his kindness to his Brethren by the *messes* he sent to them, and his particular regard to *Benjamin* his own mothers Son by sending him a *mess* five times greater than to any of the others. As therefore these *panegyres* of the *Gods* were answerable to these publick *Entertainments* of *Princes* (for all the *Nations* as well as the *Jews*, seem originally to have pretended to a *Theocracy*) so the admitting their worshippers to a *participation* in their *Sacrifices*, was according to the customs of that Age, a sign that they admitted them into the number of their

Genesis
XLIII. 34.

Chap. 7. peculiar Favourites. Accordingly it is given as a reason why *Prætus* and *Iobates* could not themselves kill *Bellerophon*, *καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν ἔθετο τὸ μὴ συμφαγεῖν* γέντας ἀλλήλοις ποτὲ καὶ ἀλλήλων θύσκειν, εἰ μὴ ὡς τὸ αὐτοῦ σφάγιος συμῆ.

Sect. 9. THUS their *Sacrifices* were plain significations of a *League* both with their *Gods* and with *one another*. But according to the account of *Porphyry* (which was generally followed by the *Primitive Christians*) it was more than so. It was also a natural means of procuring that *Mystical Union* which was designed between the *Gods* and their *Sacrifices*. For he supposes that the *Gods* which delighted in *bloody Sacrifices* were *corporeal Demons*, and did themselves also partake of the *blood* and *odor* of them, as the *Manes* were drawn by *blood* in all the *Necromantick ψυχρωγῶλαι* mentioned by *Homer* and the other ancient Poets. That accordingly those *Demons* themselves chose those *Sacrifices* which were most delightful to them, and suitable to the natures of their own particular *vehicles*. That when such were offered to them they mixed themselves with the whole *Bodies* of such *Sacrificers*, so that they who partook of the *Sacrifices*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 167

ces must also consequently partake of *Chap. 7.*
the *Deities* themselves, who being *incorporated* with their *meat*, did by that means insinuate themselves into the *Bodies* of their *worshippers*, who were also the better disposed to receive them by being themselves *dieted* by a meat so agreeable to the *vehicles* of the *Demons* themselves. That possibly was the design of the *Demons* in prescribing such singular ways of *Diet* to Persons desirous to be *initiated* to them, because otherwise it had not been in their Power to *unite* their *vehicles* to them without such predispositions. God undoubtedly would not suffer them to take possession of his creatures at their pleasure, and upon the *Hypothesis* of their *vehicles* being *corporeal*, it is not likely *themselves* would desire it without something of pleasure and *congruity* to their own *natures*, which was to be procured by such a Preparation of singular *Diet* before. And considering that according to the *grossness* of their *Vehicles* their *stations* were also allotted them by the *Principles* of the same *Philosophy*; these *Tutelary Earthly Demons* must have *Bodies* by so much *grosser* than the *Aerial* as their place was *lower*. This is the *communicating* with

Chap. 7. Devils mentioned by St. Paul, and was
 1 Cor. X. plainly supposed by the Christians in all
 20. their reasonings against them. It is
 very plain that they take it for granted
 that the Devil had taken possession of
 all them who had communicated in
 their Sacrifices. The very Infant in St.
 Cyprian who had some of the Wine of
 Libation poured into her mouth, was
 looked on as polluted with it. So
 much is implied in his words concern-
 ing her: *In corpore atque ore violato Eu-
 charistia permanere non potuit. Sanctifica-
 tus in Domini sanguine potus de pollutis
 visceribus erupit.* Much more they
 who communicated in them with a de-
 sign of devoting themselves to those De-
 vils to whom the Sacrifices were offered.

Sect. 10.

NOW on this Hypothesis the Reason-
 ing was clear both ways, both that they
 who did partake in the Sacrifices were
 supposed to be united to the Demons &
 each other, & that they who were exclu-
 ded from those Sacrifices were also exclu-
 ded from that Union. The former Reason-
 ing held, because all who communicated
 in the Sacrifices were supposed to partake
 of the Devil to whom the Sacrifices were
 offered, and to be made one Spirit with
 him, and being so must also be supposed

United

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 169

United to each other as communicating Chap. 7.
in the *same Spirit*. And on the contrary these *Sacrifices* being both *Moral* means of *Covenanting* for that *Union*, and *Natural* means of *procuring* it, they who were *excluded* from them, as they must be supposed not *already United*, so they must also be supposed *excluded* from the *Ordinary* means of *procuring* such a *Union*. And further considering this whole *Transaction* as a *Legal Act*: as the *admitting* to *Sacrifices* did not only *signify*, but in a *Legal* way *effect* the *Union*, as it obliged the *God* to *ratify* what was done in his *name* by *Persons* sufficiently *Authorized* by him; so the *Exclusion* of *Persons* from them, as transacted also in a *Legal* way, did not only *signify*, but *oblige* the *God*, in whose name they *Acted*, to *exclude* *Persons* so *Judicially excommunicated* from *partaking* in the *Invisible Sacrifices*. And therefore as the *Union* of the *Heathens* with their *Demons* was interrupted by their not *communicating* in the *same Sacrifices*; so it was reasonable to argue against the *Samaritans* that their *Union* with the *God* of *Israel* was interrupted by their not *communicating* in the *Sacrifices* of the *God* of *Israel* with his *People*

Chap. 7. ple *Israel*, because he also had taken up or allowed the use of *Sacrifices* among his own *People*, for no other end but that they might perform the same office with them as they had done formerly among the *Heathens*. I know very well the *Philosophers* stated the way of *Unity* with the *Supreme Being* on other Principles than these. But then it was on this Supposition, that *Sacrifices* were not the way to it, but only such as were *Mystical*, those of a pure mind. Which plainly supposes that the *Provincial Demons*, which were generally worshipped with *Literal* and *Bloudy Sacrifices* were none of that *Supreme Being*. So that still the *Union* with them might be, and was thought to be, performed by *Sacrifices*, which is all for which I am concerned at present. For from thence it will follow that where that same *Supreme Being* was pleased actually to order that such *Bloudy Sacrifices* should be used, and be used with a *design* on the common received Popular *Signification* of them, there his meaning was, that they should also be *Signs* and *means* of procuring this *Union* as they had been formerly.

Señ. II. 3. THEREFORE, As these Uni-

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 171

ons of Nations were managed and procured by Sacrifices, so the National Panegyres for the participating in such Sacrifices were held in one fixed and known place. I deny not but that there were other Altars and other Demons for the several subdivisions of such Nations. I only speak of such Demons as were worshiped in common by the whole Nations, and in whose worship the whole Nations were agreed and united, that those were worshiped with National Solemnities, on known returning Festivals, in known places appointed for the purpose; and that where this was done there the Nations were preserved unanimous, where it was not, they were divided with Factions and Antimosities. Thus were the Panionia for the Ionians in Asia, the Panathenaea for all the several *Δηλοι* of all Attica, the Olympicks which were Panellentia, for all that were of Greek extraction, whether in Greece or in the Greek Colonies, and the *Feria Latina* among the Romans for the whole *Latinum nomen*, as the *Ludi Magni* or *Romani* were for the Romans. And as the private Rites of Families required the attendance of all that were of the Family, so that

David

Chap. 7. *David* gives this as a reason to excuse him from his attendance on *Saul* on the *New Moon*, and among the *Romans* this was allowed as an excuse in Cases wherein very few excuses were allowed, as for *Consuls* to delay them for a while from the Service of the *Common-wealth* and for *Soldiers* to dispense with their absence from their *vexilla*; so we have reason to believe that they were obliged, who could conveniently attend, to be at these *publick Sacrifices* of their *Nation*. For as among the *Jews*, so among them also, these *Private Rites* were kept in a strict *subordination* to the *Publick*, that so the *Unions* and endearments of their *Families* might not be confederacies, but might, upon all occasions, yield to the more *Sacred Union* of their *Nation*. Therefore it was that these *Private Rites* were not of any value, unless they were allowed and approved of by the *Pontifex Maximus*, and even then were called *Sacra* rather than *Sacrificia*. So that even among them, as well as among the *Jews*, the name of *Sacrifices* was still appropriated to the *publick Altars*, as among the *Jews* the *High places* were obliged to a strict dependance on the *Publick Altars*. And where

Gather.de
Jur. Pont.
IV. 6.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 173

where these *Publick Panegyres* were Chap. 7.
not observed, there it was easy to observe the ill effects it had on their *National Correspondences*, The *National animosities* and rancors of the different *vouoi* in *Agypt* are famous, and as notorious it is that they were to be ascribed wholly to the difference of their *Religions*, not only that every *Nomos* had a *Deity* to it self, and those such in one *Nomos* as were *detested*, and *Sacrificed* in another; but because they had not for a long time any *Deities* that were *common*, nor any *Anniversary Solemnities* or *Sacrifices*, or *Altar common* to them all. And I am very apt to think this might particularly be the reason why *Moses* prescribed those *Festival Solemnities* at one certain place, and why he was so careful that no *Private Altars*, whether of the *Families*, or of the *Tribes*, should stand in competition with the *one Altar* at the constituted *place* of their *Assemblies*, because he had seen the ill consequences of the contrary Practices in *Agypt*, and was withal desirous to make *Religion* (which is indeed of it self the firmest bond of *Union*) the most effectual remedy to prevent any dissensions among

Chap. 7. mong them; in pursuance to which design it was very Prudent, and extremely well fitted to their Circumstances, to take away all private Solemnities of worship which made the differences among the *Nomi* and to ascertain times and a place for *Publick Assemblies* of the whole Nation which had been wanting among the *Egyptians*, for making *Religion* a more effectual bond of Union to their whole Nation.

Sect. 12. NOR can this conjecture seem incredible to any one who will seriously reflect on the Circumstances of *Moses* at the time of his *Legislation*. That the *Positive* Injunctions were particularly fitted to the Cases of his contemporary *Idolaters* is generally confessed. *Mai-*

Mor. Neb. monides himself insists on it as a thing that would give great light to many of those Injunctions, if the particular customs of those *Idolaters* were better known, and gives some not unlikely instances from some *Arabian* Books concerning the customs of the *Tabii*, whom he supposes to have preserved the Succession of those customs. And undoubtedly it was very agreeable to *Moses's* design to keep his People at a distance from *Idolatri* to which they were

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 175

were then so extremely *prone*, and which *Chap. 7.*
was likely to prove withal so *mischievous*
to them by the calamities it was likely
to bring upon them. But it was yet
much more for his purpose to use such
customs as were only designed for *Union*
than those which were only in opposi-
tion to their otherwise indifferent
usages. And there must needs follow
a great difference in the nature of those
two sorts of *Constitutions*. Those
Constitutions which were only designed
for *opposition*, had no more lasting need
than the *avoiding* of those *Customes*.
When they should either remove their
own dwellings to the neighbourhood
of *Nations* who had never used those
customs, or that their *Neighbouring*
Nations themselves had *changed* their
customs in such *Particulars*, there could
then be no further need of such *Cu-*
stomes as were only *designed* for *Opposi-*
tion when they *ceased* to be opposite.
But for such *Laws* as were designed for
Uniting them, tho the *occasion* of them
were a particular Case of *that Age*, yet
the *reason* of such *Constitutions* holds for
ever, as long as it is requisite that
their *Religion* should *Unite* them, and
therefore still holds proportionably un-
der

Chap. 7. der the Gospel, as it did during the whole state of the *Jewish* Dispensation. And if any *Nations* were regarded by *Moses* in the making of his Laws, there were none more likely to be so than the *Egyptians*. Their *customs*, both good and bad, were *fresh* in his Peoples memory. And there are some *Laws* which cannot be any way else so probably accounted for as by an *Egyptian Original*. To *them* and to their *Country* they had the greatest inclination. In their murmurings, they mention the *Onions* and *Garlick* and the *flesh*. Num. XI. 5. *pots of Egypt*, and motion the making of a Captain to return into *Egypt*, Num. XIV. 4. when they were not yet acquainted with the customs of the *Canaanites* or any of their *bordering Nations*; much less had entertained such favor to them, as to be in danger of them. And it is probable that the *Egyptians* had even *then* taken up the *same Idolatries* which they are known to have had afterwards. That pretence of the *Israelites*, that if they should Sacrifice in *Egypt*, they should Sacrifice the *abomination of the Egyptians before their faces*, implies plainly that the things Sacrificed by the *Israelites*, their *Sheep* and *Oxen* were even at that time,

Exod. VIII
26.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 177

time, *worshipped* by the *Ægyptians*, so Chap. 7.
that in killing them they must incur
an *æy* or *Piaculum* in the sense of those
Superstitious Zealots, which must needs
exasperate them against them. The
same thing also seems implied in that
a keeper of Cattle was counted so un- Ge. XLVI.
holy a profession, and that the *Israelites* 34.
themselves in the first *Idolatry* they were
guilty of, after their coming out of
Egypt, chose rather the resemblance
of a calf, than any other for their
Deity. So that at that time there seems
to have been a full occasion for this con-
stitution of *Moses*.

4. Therefore, *As these solemn Pane-* Sect. 13.
gyres were to be at one certain place so
were the Sacrifices to be offered on that oc-
casion to be received from one Altar.
Tho the *Multitudes Assembling* on such
occasions were more than could partake
of one *Sacrifice*; and tho the number of
Sacrifices, requisite for Feasting so great
Multitudes were more than could ordina-
rily be offered on one *Altar*, yet no
more than one *Altar* was designed for
them, that at least their blood might be
sprinkled there when it was impossible
that they could all be offered there, and
that so they might be said to partake

178 A Discourse concerning the

Chap. 7. of one Altar when yet the *Sacrifices*, on which they feasted, could not all of them be offered at one Altar. This is expressly taken notice of to have been the case of Solomon in the Dedication of his temple: *The same day did the King hallow the middle of the Court that was before the house of the Lord: for there he offered burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and the fat of the Peace offerings: because the brazen Altar that was before the Lord, was too little to receive the burnt offerings, and meat offerings, and the fat of the Peace offerings.* The number then offered of Twenty two thousand Oxen and one hundred and twenty thousand Sheep was indeed no greater than what might often be expected at the *Anniversaries* of the Nation, and the Provision therefore was not extraordinary, but such as it was intended should be constantly made use of on such occasions as often as they returned. So that consecration made a *Perpetual Right* that *Sacrifices* might for ever be burnt in that place, whenever they should again prove so numerous as that the Altar could not receive them. Yet did he not think fit to erect any more Altars but

1 Kings.
VIII. 64.

v. 63.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 179

but that *brazen one*. Why not but because he found it not agreeable to the *customs* and *significations* of those times to receive their *Sacrifices* on such solemn occasions from any more than *one Altar*, tho they were more than could be received by *one Altar*? And I believe there cannot be given an Example where-ever *one Temple* had more than *one Altar* dedicated to the *same Deity*, how numerous soever the *Sacrificers* or *Sacrifices* were that might, on such *publick Occasions*, be expected to partake of it. Which also makes it very probable that their *partaking* at *one Altar* was indeed designed as an *Emblem*, and an *Obligation* of them all to *Unity*. And this might possibly be the reason why, when it was lawful to worship the *same Deity* in *distant places*, they notwithstanding copied out the *principal Altar*. Perhaps it was *mystically* to signify that it was still the *same Altar* that they still intended to partake of, that when the *distance* of the *place* hindered their real participation with it, they yet intended to communicate with it *in effigie*, that is, as really as it was possible for them to communicate with it at a *distance*. For as the *external Participation* at a *visible Altar* was not

Chap. 7. taken, in this *Mystical* way of Communion, for a *multiplying* an *Altar* distinct from the distinct *Archetypal Altar* by which their *invisible Communion* was to be maintained with their *Deity*, but rather as a means of partaking of the *invisible Altar* from whence the *visible Altar* was supposed to be *Copied*; so neither, for the same reason, could a *distant Communion* with an *Altar* copied from that which was *Archetypal* of all *visible* ones, be taken for a *distinct Communion* with a *distinct Altar*, but rather as a means of communicating with that *original visible Altar* from which that is also supposed to have been *Copied*.

AND perhaps the *reason* of this
 Sect. 14. might have been that very ancient Custom mentioned before (as these *Sacred Rites* are the clearest Footsteps of *ancient Customs*) of entertainments, that persons * of great Quality treated their Guests, tho sitting at other Tables with *Portions* sent to them from their *own*. So it is plain in the case of *Joseph's Brethren*, that they were not at the same Table with *Joseph*. It is expressly said, that his Servants did *set on Bread for him by himself*, and for his Brethren *by themselves*, and for the *Egyptians* which did eat

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 181

eat with him by themselves: *Genesis Chap. 7.*
 XLIII. 32. Yet the *Messes* that were
 sent them, were sent them by his par-
 ticular Order, and from his *own Table*.
 For it should seem that it was not the
 custom at first to set down any thing but
Bread on the *other Tables* of the *Guests*,
 and that the *meat* was left to the disposal
 of him who treated them, according to
 the respect he was pleased to shew
 them. Accordingly these *Panegyres* of
 the *Gods* were publick Entertainments
 of their Worshipers, and the *Altars*
 were answerable to the *Tables* whereon
 the Gods themselves were served in their
own Persons. And as it was a piece
 of *state*, that how *many* Tables soever
 any great person had for his *Guests*, yet
 he never had any more than *one* for him-
 self, so it was consequently proper that
 the *Worshipers* should all be treated with
Portions from the *same Altar*. Besides,
 it seems to be the *prægustration* (if I may
 so call it) of the *Gods*, by which indeed
 the meat was thought to be *consecrated*,
 so that till the *Gods* had their *Portions*
 first, it was not fit to be feasted on by the
rest as a *Sacrifice*. This was therefore
 the sin of *Ely's Sons*, that they would
 have their *Portions* *before* the *fat* was

Chap. 7. burnt to God. 1 Sam. II. 15, 16. And perhaps this civility of *Præguſtation*, and the honor done them by receiving what *himſelf* had firſt *taste*d, and immediately from his *own hand*, might have been the reaſon why, in thoſe ſecular Entertainments, the *Guests* were to receive their meat from their *Patron's Table*. But conſidering the *Sacrifices* as the *Solemnities* of a *Covenant*, and that between the *Gods* themſelves and their *Worſhipers*; ſo it was proper that both *Parties* that covenanted ſhould partake in the ſame *Entertainment*. Otherwiſe their *Feaſting* together could not have been a *Symbol* of their *Unity*. But where multitude of *Sacrifices* were offered (as there were always great *multitudes* offered on the occaſions I am ſpeaking of) there was no poſſibility that *all* ſhould partake of *one* and the ſame *Sacrifice*. But it was reputed as *one* when *all* of them came from the ſame *Table*, and for that reaſon, and that alone, all were judged to communicate with their *God* when they communicated from the ſame *Altar* with him.

Sect. 15. 5. THEREFORE, As theſe publick *Sacrifices* were received from the ſame *Altar*, ſo the *Affairs* of that one *Altar* were always managed by one *Chief* *Prieſt*.
Tho

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 183

Tho matters of *Council* have indeed *Chap. 7*

been administred in many places by *Polyarchical Governments*, yet generally, even there where they were so, matters of *Action* have been thought best manageable by *single Presidents*. But however they were managed in *secular Causes*, yet the reason has been always thought so peculiar in *Sacred Ones*, as that I believe there can hardly be given an instance where the administration of these publick *Panegyres* was not committed to a *single Priest*, who presided over the rest. If the *Jews* had their *High Priests* besides their *ordinary Priests* and *Levites*, so also the *Heathens* had those who were answerable to them. The

Romans had their *Pontifex Maximus*, besides their *ordinary Pontifices*, and

Aeditui: the *Greeks* their *Ἀρχιερεῖς*, *ἱερεῖς* and *νεωύτεροι*. *Manetho* himself writes

himself an *Ἀρχιερεὺς*. And these three

Orders in their *Sacred Rites* were so extremely usual, that the name of *Tertia*

Sacra in *Manilius* is used for the Office of an *Aedituus* or *νεωύτερος*. Accord-

ingly *Synesius* describes the three Offices which they were to exercise in passing

through those three degrees: *Δεῖ γὰρ*

τοὺς πρῶτον ἀποδύνασι τὴν ἀγέμιναν, καὶ

N 4

Ap. Scal.
Fragm. Gr.
Euseb. Chr.
p. 6. Astro.

Dion. p. 52
B. c.

ταῖς

Chap. 7. τὰ μικρὰ ἐποπιδῶσαι πρὸ τοῦ μεγάλου, καὶ χορῶσαι πρὶν διαδ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ διαδ' αὐτοῦ πρὶν ἱεροφανῆσαι.

And I am apt to think that the *Sacrifice* could hardly have been otherwise performed rightly. For this *presiding Priest* seems to have *personated* the God in whose Worship he was employed.

Heb. V. 1.

He was καὶ διάκονος τοῦ πρὸς τὸ θεόν, as the *Apostle* expresses it. And therefore as the God was *one*, so must also his *Representative*. Alluding to the similitude of *Entertainments*, he was the *Symphiarcha* who was to administer all the management of them. And being thus a *Representative* of the *Deity*, they could not have received their Portions from the *Deity*, but by receiving them from the hands of the *Priest*, and therefore whoever received not from the *Priest* could not be said to *communicate* at the *Altar* where he officiated. On which account it plainly appears that this *Unity* of the *Priesthood* was as well necessary for this *mystical Unity* of the *Communicants*, as the *Unity* of his *Altar*.

CHAP.

C H A P. VIII.

The Jewish Sacrifices, as Mysteries, caused a Mystical Union and Communion with God, dependent on their External Communion with their High Priest.

The CONTENTS.

The Jews, before our Saviour's coming, had taken up this way of mysticizing their Law. Sect. I. The Jewish Sacrifices were most properly Mysteries. Sect. II. How these Mystical Sacrifices promoted a Union with the Deity by a Union with the Priesthood. 1. The admitting Persons to the Mysteries was the peculiar Office of the High Priesthood. Sect. III. 2. In this Office the High Priests represented a more Sacred Person than their own. Sect. IV. The Dæmon peculiarly concerned in this affair of restoring Souls was the Demiurgus. Sect. V. It was thought impious for any Creature to intermeddle in it as a Creature. Sect. VI. The Jews understood

Chap. 8.

stood their own Worship to perform the Office of Mysteries. Sect. VII. The λόγος was the Demiurgus peculiarly concerned in Revealing the Heavenly Mysteries. Sect. VIII. The Jewish High Priest represented the λόγος herein. Sect. IX. X. None but the High Priest did so. Sect. XI. 3. The High Priest represented the λόγος particularly in relation to the Benefits of the Mystical ἑνώσις and Κοινωνία.

1. Union and Communion with the Father was to be procured by Union and Communion with the λόγος. Sect. XII. A mystical κοινωνία owned in the Hellenistical Philosophy of those Times. Sect. XIII. How appropriated to the λόγος by the Principles of the same Philosophy. Sect. XIV. The same λόγος the Principle of Union both to the Sensible World. Sect. XV. And to the Intellectual. Sect. XVI.

2. Union and Communion with the λόγος was supposed to depend on external Communion with the High Priest as one who particularly represented the λόγος in this Office of mystically signifying and causing this External Unity. Sect. XVII.

•
THUS

THUS it was in the ordinary *Popular Sacrifices*. But in the *Mysteries* the thing went higher, which it will be necessary to explain, in order to the clearing the Argument, as it was used by the *Jews* against the *Samaritans*, and by the *Christians* against their contemporary *SCHISMATICKS*. In order whereunto, it is to be remembered 1. What I have elsewhere proved more particularly, that the *Jews* had, long long before the beginnings of *Christianity*, taken up this custom of expounding their *Law mystically*. Even this same *Ptolemy Philometor*, who sate as Judge of the forementioned Dispute between the *Jews* and the *Samaritans*, had a Book of *Allegorical Expositions* of the *Law* dedicated to him by *Aristobulus* the *Peripatetick*. And it seems to have been very ancient among them that they grounded their *Allegorical Expositions* on that received sense of the Command to *Moses*, of making all things according to the fashion shewed him in the Mount, which is also applyed this way by the *Apostle* himself in his Epistle to the *Ebrians*. And indeed most of the Reasonings

Sep. prov'd
Schisma-
tic.

Exod.
XXV. 40.
Heb. VIII.
5.

Chap. 8. Reasonings of that Epistle proceed on this Hypothesis, that all those *external* Institutions of the *Law* were only *Shadows* and *Resemblances* copied out from the *invisible Patterns* and *Prototypes*; That the *real* Benefit was received from the *Prototypes*, and that these *Shadows* were of no further use than as *mystical means* of communicating with the *Prototypes*; That the *Gospel* exhibited the *Prototypes* themselves in a way more immediate and certain and becoming the *Divine Designs*, and that accordingly the state of the *Gospel* was only the state of the *Mystical*, that is, indeed, of the more *Beneficial Israelitism*, and the fulfilling of those *mystical Senses* of those *Legal Writings* which were the *Senses* principally designed by the *Holy Ghost*.

Seet. 2. AND indeed the *Mysteries* were most proper to be made use of and applyed on this occasion. The *Mysteries* were most allowed of by those who approved not of other *bloody Sacrifices*. *Porphyry* himself, and those of the *Pythagorean* way, did not only approve of those, but even on a *Philosophical* Account were ambitious of *initiation* into all the famous received *Mysteries*. And particularly *Mysteries* were
thought

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 189

thought to be peculiarly useful for the *Chap. 8.*

procuring *Spiritual Benefits*, and such as peculiarly related to the *other world*.

The *popular Sacrifices* seemed to aim no higher than the transacting for *wordly Benefits*; and the *covenanting* with their *Gods* for their *worldly Protection*, and the flourishing of their *Commonwealths*; but the *Mysteries* were principally designed for a *Purgation* of the *Soul*, and bringing them to a more familiar and nearer conversation with their *Deities*, and bettering their passage into the *other Life*, which Considerations will make them more proper for the *Jewish Institution*, which in this very same Case exceeded the *Popular Sacrifices* of the *Heathens*, that they were particularly designed for the *Benefits* of the *Souls* of the *Communicants*, and with regard to the *future state*. And indeed the *Benefits* of the *mystical* *ἑνῶσις* and *κοινωνία*, which are the main things which are fundamentally supposed in the Reasonings concerning which I am at present discoursing, were more properly to be expected from their *Mysteries* than their *popular Sacrifices*. And that which yet brings this consideration nearer to our present design is that, the *Popular Sacrifices* were only

Chap. 8. only proper for that *inferior* sort of *Tutelary Demons* who, as I said, had *Vehicles* gross enough to be sensibly affected by them; but *mystical Sacrifices* alone were thought agreeable to the dignity of the Worship of the *Supreme*

De Abstin. *Deity*. This is the plain sense of *Porphyry* in that excellent and elaborate Work of his so often mentioned. Seeing therefore that the *Fews* pretended to worship the *Supreme Numen* by their *Sacrifices*, it was requisite, pursuant to these Principles; that their *Sacrifices* should not only be *Sacrifices*, but *Mysteries* also. For plainly they intended to receive all that *benefit* from their *Sacrifices* alone, which the *Heathens* expected from both their *Sacrifices* and their *Mysteries*. And thus certainly the *Hellenistical Fews* did actually understand the design of the *Sacrifices*. They designed their *visible Altar* as a means of communicating with that which was *Mystical* and *Invisible*. They also allowed of a *Mystical Invisible Priesthood* of the $\Lambda\omicron\Gamma\omicron\varsigma$ with whom they were to communicate by maintaining a *Communion* with their *visible Priesthood*.

Sect. 3. IN order therefore to the clearing how this *Union* with the *Priesthood* was a means

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 191

a means of maintaining their *Union* with *Chap. 8.*

the *Deity*, I shall consider the *Jewish Sacrifices* as *Mysteries*, and so shew what Reasoning would have been counted solid in those Ages, proceeding on the Popular received Notions concerning *Mysteries*. 1. Therefore the admitting persons to *initiation* in the *Mysteries* was the peculiar Privilege of the *Supreme Priest*, and not communicated to the ordinary *inferior Priests* without his leave. Thus it was with the *Athenians* in their *Eleusinian Mysteries*. They were at the disposal of the *Hierophanta*, *Met. Eleusin. c.* who had therefore the Title of *Mystagogue* from leading those that were *initiated*, who were called *Mystæ*, into the *ἄδελφον*, and shewing them the *Image* of the *Deity*. So it was also in the *Egyptian Mysteries* of *Isis*. Tho the *other Priests* might by the appointment of the *Goddeſs* be employed in the Service, yet it was to the *Primarius Sacerdos* that *Apuleius* made his Address that he might be *admitted*, and that the admission might be *hastened*. *Apuleius Metam. XI.*

2. ACCORDING to this Rule *S. 67. 4.* of the proceedings of *Mysteries* the *Chief Priests* represented, in this particular Ministry, a greater and more sacred

Chap. 8. sacred Person than their own. In the Olympick Games dedicated to *Jupiter Olympicus*, the *Alytarcha*, or Chief Priest, who presided over them, represented the person of *Jupiter* himself, to whom those Games were devoted. That was the fancy of *Dioclesian*, who when he had so represented the person of *Jupiter* would no longer bear that of the *Emperor*. These are the words of *Johannes Antiochenus* concerning him as they are quoted from the *M. S.* καὶ λυτάρχης ἐν

L. XII. in
Not. ad
Marmor.
Oxon. p.
112, 113.

Ἀντιοχείᾳ ὁ αὐτὸς Διοκλητιανὸς, καὶ Ἀποθέ-
μηνον τὸ βασιλικὸν χῆμα μετὰ τὴν πλεονε-
σαι τὰ Ὀλύμπια ἐν εἰληῷ βασιλεύσαι,
λέγων ὅτι ἀπεδέμνω τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ ἐ-
φόρεσα χῆμα τῷ ἀθανάτῳ Διὶ, &c.

Meurs. ib.
Eleusin. c.
14.

In the *Eleusinian Mysteries* the High Priest had the Name and Person of the *Demiurgus*, the *Daduchus* of the *Sun*, the ὁ ἐπὶ βωμῷ, or he that officiated at the *Altar*, in sacrificing, of the *Moon*, or the ἱερεὺς κήρυξ (or he that spoke to the *People* what was ordered to be spoken on those occasions, plainly answering the κήρυκες employed on the like Services of assembling or dismissing the *People* by the Kings in *Homer*) that of *Mercury* who performed the same Office to *Jupiter* that he was to do, on these Solemnities,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 193

to the *Demiurgus*. By the answerable Chap. 8.

ness of these other Offices, and Changes of *Names* in them, it plainly appears, that by the name of *Demiurgus* they did not allude to the notion of it for a secular *Magistracy*; but to that wherein it was used by the *Philosophers*, and from thence derived from them by the *Gnosticks*, for the *Maker* of the *World*. It was to this *Demiurgus* that the *Sun* and *Moon*, the two *Craters* of $\nu\sigma$ s and $\Psi\chi\eta$, according to *Plato's Timæus*, were supposed to have that relation in framing the *Souls* of the *inferior World*. And accordingly as this *Deity* was ἀκατονόμας, so was the *Priest* who officiated herein unlawful to be named by his *Mysta* initiated by him to whom he had performed the Office of the *Demiurgus*. So *Eunapius* concerning him by

Eunap. in
Maxim.
Sophist.

τῆς ἱερωσύνης κατ' ἐκείνον τ' ἑρῶνον ὅς τις ὡς
τῶνομα, ὃ μοι δέμης λέγαν. ἔτελλε γὰρ τ'
ταῦτα γράφοντα, καὶ εἰς ἑυμολπίδας ἦγε.
This does sufficiently imply, that tho the *pretence* of the institution of these *Mysteries* were only the *Worship* of *Ceres* and *Proserpine*, and the *Commemoration* of the *Rape* of *Proserpine* by *Pluto*; yet the *design* was higher, even the resto-

Chap. 8. ring lapsed *Souls* to their primitive happy condition. This was indeed the benefit they expected by them in "Αδης, the *invisible state*, comprehending both estates of *Happiness* and *Misery*. This was the clearing them out of the βόεορ in which *uninitiated Souls* were supposed to stick. And possibly the whole Fable of the *Rape of Proserpine* by *Pluto*, might indeed signify nothing else but this degenerate state of *lapsed Souls*, their fall from *Heaven*, and their being imprisoned by *Bodies*, and by that means confined and *captivated* in these lower Regions under the *Moon*, which *Bodies* and which *Places* were supposed obnoxious to the Jurisdiction of the δάιμων ὕλης whom they called *Pluto*. So that the *Purgation* here expected might be the clearing the *Soul* of this Clog, and pollution of the *Body*, and the restoring it to its native *Purity*, which would in consequence cause the πτεροφύσις which would enable it to mount *beyond* the Regions of its *Exile*, beyond the *Moon* where the Jurisdiction of this *Corporeal Demon* was supposed to determine.

Sect. 5. This κἀποδ΄ ὁ ψυχῆς, as κἀποδ΄ ὁ signifies properly a return from *Banishment*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 195

ment, was that which was pretended Chap. 8.

as the great design of *Philosophy*, and of the *Mysteries*, which (as they were explained by those who defended them against the *Atheists* and *Epicureans*) were indeed intended for nothing else but a *mystical* sort of *Philosophy*. And for this purpose it was very proper for them to expect this benefit from those *Demons* who were to have an influence in *performing* this deliverance, and who had therefore the best reason both to *know* and to *covenant* for the means of this deliverance, as having it alone in their power to *perform* such *Covenants* when made. For so these *Mysteries* were always understood, not as bare *Representations* only, but also as *obligations* to *perform* what was *signified* by such *Representations*, only the best way of knowing what was *promised* was to consider what was *represented*, and by whom the *Representation* was *instituted*, whether it were by such a Being to whom the *performance* did properly belong. When they understood what *this* was, they had *then* as much reason to expect *performance*, on condition of *performance* of *Conditions* on their own parts, as they had to believe their *Gods* veraci-

Chap. 8. ous. Now the *significations* here represented, were very proper for representing this *deliverance* of the *Soul* from these lower Regions. The *binding Souls* into *bodies* was properly the work of the *Demiurgus*, & therefore the *loosing* them was also most properly to be expected from *him*; the *Sun* and the *Moon* were the two *Craters*; the one of Νῆς, the other of Ψυχῆ, by which the *Mind* was bound in the *Body*, the which being also the *Moon*, to which the *Jurisdiction* of this *Terrestrial Demon* was supposed to extend, was therefore conceived to put it into his *power*, to *fasten* or *loosen* these bonds. As for the Representation of *Mercury* it is well known that one of the *Employments* of that *God* was to conduct the *Souls* to *Hades*, and that his *Caduceus* had a particular influence over the *Spirits* of that place, and his *Petastus* or *Orcus* peculiarly fitted his employment in those *invisible Regions*, and that he had an acknowledged *Power* of *bettering* the *passage* of the *Souls* committed to his Charge. So was also the unclean Representation of *Banbo* an Emblem of the *Genesis*. So that by the whole contrivance of these Representations the design seems to be the *signifying*, and therefore

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 197

therefore the effecting this delivery of Chap. 8.
the *Soul* from this inferior *World*. These
were the *Powers* proper for that pur-
pose in the general sense of the Philoso-
phy of that Age that were orthodox in
the point of the *Deity*. They were
very agreeable to the *Hypotheses* of the
Pythagoreans, the *Chaldee Oracles*, the
Writings under the name of *Mercury*,
the *Cyrenaic* Philolophy in the Hymns of
Synesius, and the Writings of *Porphyrus*
and *Macrobius*. And it is very easie to
observe what multitudes of the Notions
of the *Gnosticks* were hence derived, if
it were requisite in order to the shewing
how universally these Notions were re-
ceived in those later times of *Judaism*,
and *Primitive Times* of *Christianity*.

AND as it was thus proper for the Sect. 6.
Demiurgus to preside in this design of
restoring *Souls* to their native *Purity* and
Freedom; so it was indeed thought im-
proper for any *Creature* to mediate in it
as a *Creature*, which seems to be the
true reason why the *Hierophanta* in this
Employment was to personate the *De-
miurgus*. For the reduction of *Souls* was
to be by an ἀναρῳγὸς φῶς, a *Light* that
was to let them into the *Secrets* of their
God, and to awaken them from the dull-
ness

Chap. 8. nefs and forgetfulness of their mortal bodies, and to remind them of their nobler Original. But it was a most *Piacular* Crime for any Creature to intrude into the *Secrets* of their Gods without their leave. This was shadowed to the People in the Fictions of *Actæon* and *Diana*, and other like stories of the *Mythical* Age, as of *Proteus* stealing Fire from the Chariot of the Sun, &c. Indeed as to the *intellectual World* and the *Secrets* of it, they did not think that any but a God could discover them. However they thought it most decorous that none but a God should lead them into the *Divine Secrets*. Thence so many Expressions of *Manilius* to this purpose, which *Scaliger* does not seem to understand:

Manil. A-
f ro rom. I.

f. 2. v. 29.

ib. L. II. p.

33. v. 6, 7.

ib. L. IV. p.

108. v. 7,

8, &c.

ib. L. V. p.

Inque Deum Deus ipse tulit——

And again :

*Quis Cælum possit, nisi Cæli munera nôsset,
Et reperire Deum, nisi qui pars ipse De-*
orum est?

And

And again :

*Atqui adeo faciem Cæli non invidet orbi
Ipse Deus, vultusque suos, corpusque re-
cludit*

*Semper volvendo, seque ipsum inculcat &
offert,*

Ut bene cognosci possit, doceátque videndo,

Qualis eat, doceátque suas attendere Leges.

Ipse vocat nostros animos ad sidera munda :

*Nec patitur, quia non condit, sua jura
latere.*

*Quis putat esse nefas nosci, quod cernere fas
est?*

This therefore we see he makes to be the only way of excusing the *Piaculum*, that the God himself was pleased to make the discovery. So *Philo* also from the same *Egyptian* and *Stoical* Hypothesis, which had been observed by *Manilius* :

Πῶς ἂν ἐνόησεν ἡ ψυχὴ θεὸν εἰ μὴ ἐνέπνοσε
καὶ ἡ ψατο αὐτῆς καὶ δυνάμιν ; καὶ γὰρ ἂν ἐτόλ-
μιζε τοσούτον ἀνασπαρμῆν ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νῆς,
ὡς ἀντιλαβέσθαι θεοῦ φύσεως, εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς ὁ
θεὸς ἀνέσπασεν αὐτὸν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ὡς ἐν τῷ
ἀνθρώπινον νῆν ἀνασπαρμῆναι . καὶ ἐτύπωσε
καὶ τοὺς ἐφικτοὺς νοηθῆναι δυνάμεις .

And
as

Chap. 8. as this was supposed true in the more spiritual Transactions between *God* and the *Soul* of the *initiated* Person; so it was very suitably represented in this way of transacting the *external* part of the *Mystery*, that the *secret sights* of the *Adytum*, from seeing which they were called *Epoptæ*, should be shewn them by one who should *personate* the *Demiurgus* himself, and bear his *name* in that particular performance.

Sect. 7. TO apply this therefore to the Reasonings of the *Hellenistical Jews* against the *Samaritans*; they also challenged to themselves this power of *restoring Souls* to their *Cælestial Original* by means of *God's* own appointment. This is very clear in *Philo*, and in such of them as lived *after* the time that the *future state* was more fully and clearly discovered than it had been before, which was the nearer they came to the time of publishing the *Gospel*. And undoubtedly they had, even by the Principles of the *Philosophers* themselves, a better *Title* to it than the *Heathens*, in regard that their whole *external Worship* was paid to this same *Demiurgus* to whom this Office was supposed properly to belong. They also thought themselves to have the

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 201

the best *Right* to the *Secrets* and *Myste- Chap. 8.*
ries of their *God*. The *Secrets* of the *Pl.XXV.*
Law were with them that feared him; and 14.
 from the same notions in all likelyhood
 it was that our *Saviour* ascribes the *Right*
 of knowing *Mysteries* to them whom he *S. Matth.*
 owns for the *Children of the Kingdom*. XIII. 11.
 And the *High Priest's* going into the *S. Mark,*
Sanctum Sanctorum was indeed nothing IV. 11.
 but a most sacred *πλετη*. The *Myste- S. Luke,*
ries of the *Heathens* were in the *Adyta,* VIII. 10.
 so was *this*. They were under a *Veil*,
 so was *this*, whence *Christ* is said as a
Melchizedechian High Priest, to have
 passed within the *Veil*. Accord-
 ingly the *tearing* of the *Veil* at our Sa-
 viour's *Death* signified the *Revelation*
 and *Discovery* of the *Mystery* which had
 been hidden from *Ages and Generations*,
 so much alluded to in the *New Testament*.
 There was an *επισημεια* of a *Light*, and
 the *Image* of their *God*, and he was
 also an *επισημεια* of the *Shechinah*, the
Light and Glory that shadowed the *Mer-*
cy-Seat. The *Demiurgus* also worshiped
 in the *Mysteries* was not to be named.
 So were the *Fews* supposed to worship
 the *ἀκατονομαστον*, and accordingly *Jose-*
phus in the mission of *Moses* dares not
 let the *Greeks* know the *name* by which *Philo Leg.*
 God *ad Caium.*
p.1041. B.
Josep. Ant.

Chap. 8. God was pleased to discover himself to *Moses*. The *Heathen Mysteries* as expounded by the *Stoicks* and the later *Philosophers*, shadowed the Systeme of the *World*. So is the *Ark* and the several Coverings of it expounded by *Josephus* (which is a fit reason why it should be called a *ἅγιον κοσμητόν* by the *Apostle*, not only as a *Worldly Temple*, but as a *Temple* also representing the *World*) and so is the *Mercabah* in *Ezekiel* alluded to in the Ornaments of the *Temple*, mysticized even by the *Modern Jews*, as may appear from the intimations of *Maimonides*.

Seet. 8. A N D according to the *Hellenistical Hypothesis*, the *Spiritual* and *Invisible* *Ἐποπτεία* was of the *Ideal Archetypes* of things. These were the first νοητὰ, and the speculation of them was the νόσις and ἐπιστήμη and γνῶσις. The *Harmony* of these was called ἀλήθεια, and they who had the *Right* to know them were said to be ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ in the *Mystical Language* of *S. John*. But it was in the λόγος that these *Ideal Archetypes* of things were supposed to be, not in the ταγαθόν, to which they would not allow even such a *Multiplicity*. And it is therefore very suitable to this what the *Apostle*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 203

Apostle speaks when he grants that in Chap. 8. him were hidden all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge. At least the manifestation of them to others was taken for the peculiar Office of the λόγος. For this is always taken for granted in the Reasonings of the Hellenists, that the Father never appeared, nor was κατὰ ληπτός, capable of being reached (not thoroughly comprehended only) by human senses; but that the λόγος was κατὰ ληπτός, not thoroughly comprehended, but reached by the sense (for so the word was meant against the Pyrrhonians who denied any thing to be κατὰ ληπτόν) and therefore thus it was that the Hellenists proved that there was indeed a subsistent λόγος distinct from the Supreme Being, whom they call ὁ ὅτι πᾶσι, because there was a Being called God which had oftentimes appeared to Men in visible Resemblances. And thus S. Justin Martyr proves it against Tryphon, by which time the Jews it seems, out of inveteracy to the Christian Religion, had forgot, or endeavoured to obliterate the memory of their own Reasonings before, when they found them urged with such success and service to the Christian Religion. So that when we find the like Expressions

Chap. 8. Expressions in the New Testament, concerning God the Father, That he dwells in that Light which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, or can see; And, That no man hath seen God at any time; And again, That no man hath seen God at any time: but that the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him; And, That none knows the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him, &c. These are exactly fitted to the Hypothesis I am speaking of, and accordingly prove it not only commonly received by the *Hellenistical Jews* of that Age, but true in it self, because it is confirmed by the *New Testament Revelation*.

Sect. 9. HENCE it followed, that the φανέρωσις, or ἀποκάλυψις or ἐκφαντορία, (these are all of them proper terms of this *Mystical Language* relating to this discovery of *Mysteries*) were proper to the λόγος. And accordingly he must be the *Invisible* or *Spiritual Hierophanta* and *Priest*, performing invisibly all that was visibly transacted by the *High Priest* in this visible Ministry. He was to assist at the *Invisible Ideal Altar*, and to offer up *Mystical Sacrifices*, as the *High Priest* did visible ones on the visible Altar. And

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 205

And by the same Reasoning this was indeed so very requisite that the *visible Priesthood* and its whole *Ministry*, was of no farther force and benefit than as it *applied* the efficacy of those *invisible* performances as well as it *signified* and *represented* them. The Title of Ἀρχιερεὺς, is accordingly given to the λόγος. And the *High Priest* in going into the *Holy of Holies* personated the entrance of the λόγος into *Heaven*, according to the *Reasoning* of the Author to the *Ebrians*. The *High Priest* therefore, in this *Ministry*, must have *personated* the λόγος himself the same way as the *Eleansinian Hierophanta* was conceived to *personate* the *Demiurgus*; and that to the same effects and purposes of Reasoning, that this was an instituted means of partaking of the *Invisible Priesthood* by communication with the *Visible*, as it was to partake of the beneficial influences of the *Demiurgus* by partaking with the *Hierophanta*; and, on the contrary, that the want of this *visible Priesthood* and *Sacrifices* must also consequentially *deprive* the person who *wanted* them (especially who were *deprived* of them, by them who had the *Power* of them) of the means of attaining these *invisible influences*

Philo de
Migr. A-
brahami P.
404. A.

Chap. 8. influences also of the *invisible Priesthood*.

Sect. 10. THAT it was the λόγος and none else but he, that was supposed to be represented by the *High Priesthood* appears by that passage of *Philo*, which it will not be amiss to transcribe, because, tho it allude to *Christian* Phrases and Notions, yet commonly *Christians* have neither been sensible how much their Notions were received by those *Hellenistical Jews*, nor how they were and must have been understood in the *Originals* from whence they were first derived.

His words are these: Αναγκάων γὰρ ἦν ὁ ἱερωμὴν τῷ τῷ κόσμῳ παλεῖ, καθ' ἡλικίαν χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τῷ ἀρετῷ ἢ πρὸς τὴν ἀμνησίαν ἀμαρτημάτων, καὶ χορηγίας ἀφθονοτάτων ἀγαθῶν. Ἰσως μὲντοι καὶ περιδιάσκει τὸν θεόν θεοφωδῶν, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῷ κοσμοποιῶν δυνατὸν, ἀλλὰ τῷ γε κόσμῳ διωκεῖς ἀξιὸν εἶναι φεῖσθαι, ὅτι τὸ μίμημα ἐνδύμενος, ὁφείλει τῇ διανοίᾳ, τὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸν εὐδὺς ἀγαλματοφορεῖν, αὐτὸς τρέπον πᾶν πρὸς τὸν τῷ κόσμῳ φύσαν ἔξ ἀνθρώπου μεθερμώσθαι, καὶ, εἰ θέμις εἴπω (θέμις ἢ ἀφευδῆν ἀληθείας λέγειν) βραχὺς κόσμος εἶναι.

Here he owns *him* who was represented by the *High Priest* to be the *Son*, to be the

Philo vit:

Mos. Lib.

III. p. 673.

C.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 207

the *Paraclete*, to be the *Intercessor* for Chap. 8.
Forgiveness of Sins, and for the be-
 stowing ἀφθονοτάτων ἀγαθῶν, whether
 by the word ἀφθονοτάτων be understood
 the *plenty* of those *good things*, which is
 an ordinary notion of the word; or
 which I rather incline to believe, the
liberality by which they are given, with-
 out *grudging*, for that is also a notion of
 φθόνου, and in that sense it is commonly
 reasoned in the Hypothesis of that
Age, that the θεῖον was not φθονερόν,
 but gave *freely* its good gifts without
 any mean or mercenary consideration.
 These are the very *Terms* of the *New*
Testament. That he also calls him the
World was exactly agreeable to the
Egyptian Hypothesis of that *Age*. The
 best account of that we have in the
 Writings ascribed to *Hermes*. And he
 is most express in this particular. He
 makes two *Images* of *God*, the *World*,
 and the *Archetypal Man*, the ἀνθρῶπι-
 οειδέος. He allows them the name of
Sons, and makes them ὁμοῖοι with the
Father. This Doctrine is also else-
 where owned by *Philo* himself. And
 in all likelihood it is the meaning of
Manilius, who took what he had from
Egyptian Authors, where he makes the
World

Pamand.
Asclep.

Chap. 8. *World* it self to be its own *Hierophanta* in the place already produced. That is the *Archetypal Intellectual World* was supposed to be the *discoverer* of its own *Ideas*; and of the *sensible World*, in which regard none but the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\Theta$ could be understood by this name of the *World*. Consequently hereunto they made the *World* it self to be the *Archetypal Temple* of which the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\Theta$ was the *Priest*, as the *Reasonable Soul* answers it in the notion of a *Temple* in an inferior sense in which the $\acute{o}\ \kappa\alpha\tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\Theta$ is the *Priest*, of which he makes the *visible High Priest* the immediate Resemblance. $\Delta\upsilon\omicron\ \gamma\delta\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \epsilon\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\nu,$
Philo de $\acute{\iota}\epsilon\rho\epsilon\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma,$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\acute{\omicron}\sigma\mu\Theta,$ $\epsilon\iota\ \tilde{\omega}\ \eta\delta\epsilon$
Somhiis. p. $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\chi\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\sigma\Theta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\epsilon}\ \delta\epsilon\iota\Theta\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\Theta,$
597. C. $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\nu\ \tilde{\eta}\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\ \Psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta},$ $\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\iota}\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\Theta,$ $\xi\ \mu\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\mu\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\iota\alpha\delta\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma\ \delta\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\epsilon\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu,$ $\acute{\omicron}\$
 $\tilde{\tau}\ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\acute{\lambda}\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\pi\tilde{\eta}\ \alpha\iota\ \chi\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta'\ \acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\alpha\delta\alpha\iota$
 $\tau\tilde{\epsilon}\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\mu\alpha\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha\ \xi\rho\alpha\nu\tilde{\epsilon},$ $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\rho\epsilon\rho\gamma\tilde{\eta}\ \kappa\epsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\acute{\omicron}\sigma\mu\Theta\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omega,$ $\kappa\epsilon\ \tau\tilde{\omega}\ \pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\Theta.$ And he elsewhere prosecutes this Analogy of the *World* to a *Temple* in the several Requisites of a *Temple*

De Monar.
L.II. init.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 209

a Temple, That Heaven is the *Sanctum* Chap. 3.
Sanctorum, that the Stars are the ἀναθηματα
 answering the *Donaries* of ordinary
Temples; that the *Priests* are the *Angels*,
 &c. This was a Notion very much in-
 troduced by the *Stoicks*, with a very
 prudent design of making men every
 where behave themselves *Religiously* as
 they would in *Temples*, on this conside-
 ration, that all places were the *Temples*
 of God. And thus it appears how man
 by being a *little World* was thought to
 resemble the *great World*, and by re-
 sembling it was to partake of its influen-
 ces; and how aptly the *High Priest*
 herein personated the λόγος, that as his
Vestments represented the *visible World*,
 so *Himself* represented the *intellectual*
World by which the *visible* was govern-
 ed, which was no other, as I said, than
 the λόγος. This is also the express
 Doctrine of *Philo*.

Lips. Physic.
olog. Sto-
ic. L. II.
Dissert. 7.

Philo de
Opif. Mun.
p. 5. C.

BUT withal as this was true of the
Priest, so it was true of no other of them
 but the *High Priest*. It is of his Gar-
 ments peculiarly that the Observation
 was made that the *World* was represented
 by them. And that peculiar and most
Sacred, and most *Mystical* Part of the
Priesthood was performed by him alone.

Sect. II.

P

He

Chap. 8. He alone had the Privilege of entring into the *Sanctum Sanctorum*, which was the proper ἑποπτεία and ἱεροφαντεία, which as I said, was the peculiar *Prerogative* of the λόγος. As for the other *Priests*, it is not the λόγος, but the *Angels*, the ἀσώματοι ψυχαί, the ὑποδιδάκονοι of the λόγος, that *Philo* himself makes to answer them in the *Mystical Temple* of the *Intellectual World*, in the places now mentioned *de Monarchiâ*. So that there is no reason to think that they were either meant, or included in this way of Reasoning. And then as they who were excluded from their *Sacrifices* as under an ἄγος, were supposed to be under the Power of *evil Demons*, till they were expiated; So much more they who were not, by the *Mysteries*, rescued by the λόγος from the Power of the *Demon* ὕλης, were still supposed to be detained by him in their *Vehicles*, which would confine them to those Regions below the *Moon* which were the Jurisdiction of that *Demon*, who was no other than he whom in the Language of *Christianity* we call the *Devil*. By which Principles the Mischief will appear which must befall them who either were not in *Communion* with the High Priest,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 211

Priest, or had *separated* themselves from him, or were *excluded* by just Censures. Chap. 8.
As by their being *divided* from him they were *cut off* from this *Communication* with the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$, so they must consequently be *deprived* of all the *benefits* of that *Communication*. They must want the *benefit* of his ἐνδιαμεσίτης , his *Intercession*; they must want the *benefit* of his *Mystical Sacrifice*, of *Expiation* of their *Sins*; and of procuring *Spiritual Blessings*. They must also be supposed to be left *destitute* in the condition wherein they were before, to be *detained* in those *Vehicles* which would hinder them from mounting above the *Moon*, and would *confine* them within the reach of their *Enemy* and most implacable *Tormentor*. These were Consequences very natural and clear from the Principles and Reasonings of those Ages, as I have now explained them.

AND further 3. As the *High Priest* Sect. 12. represented the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ as to other things, so particularly in relation to the *Benefits* of the *Mystical* ἑνώσις and κοινωνία , so that as by the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ they were *invisibly united* to the *Father*, and communicated in the *Benefits* following that Union, so it was by a *visible Union* to the *High*

Chap. 8. *Priesthood* that they were to be united to the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$, and to expect the Benefits of that *Union* and *Communion*. The full proof of this will appear in these particulars: That the *Union* and *Communion* with the *Father* was to be procured by *Union* and *Communion* with the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$, whose Office it properly was to procure and promote this *Union*; That *Union* and *Communion* with the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$ was to be procured by external *Communion* with the *High Priest*, as one who particularly represented the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$ in this Office of mystically signifying and causing this internal *Unity*. These things are to be made out from the received Principles of those Ages, which will both explain and prove the Solidity of the Reasonings which were grounded on them.

I. Then *Union* and *Communion* with the *Father* was to be procured by *Union* and *Communion* with the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$. The Mystical $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\omega\nu\iota\alpha$ was indeed grounded on the $\epsilon\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, the Commerce and Communication of Mystical Benefits did necessarily suppose a *Union* with those from whom the Benefits were expected, as the Communication in vital influences supposes a vital *Union* of Members in the natural Body. Whence the Reasoning will follow

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 213

follow both ways, That they who are *Chap. 8.*
united will have a Title to the *κοινωνία*,
 as *Living Members* must needs partake
 of the influences of the *Head*; and ne-
gatively, That they who are, by any
 means whatsoever *cut off* from *Union*
 must also be *cut off* from *Communion* with
 the *Father*, as whatever Member is *cut*
off from the *Body natural* cannot any
 longer lay any claim to the influences of
 the *Head*.

PLAINLY the notion of *κοινωνία* *Seet. 13.*
 seems to be taken immediately from the
Sacrifices. For thus the *Apostle* reasons
 from *Notions* and *Principles* which must
 have been received among the *Heathens*,
 because in truth the aggravation of the
 Sin he disputes against, must have been
 derived from *their sense* and understand-
 ing of the *Fact* he speaks of, especially
 considering that he does professedly *deny*
 any *intrinsic evil* in the *Fact* abstract-
 ing from the *Opinions* of others, and the
scandal taken from their interpretation
 of it, *Rom. XIV. 14.* According there-
 fore to those *received opinions*, they who
 did *eat* the *Sacrifices of the Altar*, are
 said to be *κοινωνοὶ* with the *Altar*, *1 Cor.*
X. 18. And they who did *eat* of the
 things offered to *Devils* were *κοινωνοὶ τῶ*

Chap. 8. *ἑορταστικῶν*, Verse 20. From hence in the way of *Mystical Interpretation*, the *mystical κοινωνία* will be a participation in the *Mystical Sacrifice* offered by the *Ἀδύτῃ* as *High Priest* to the *Father*. For so the *Father* being the *Deity* to whom those *Mystical Sacrifices* were immediately designed and addressed, the communicating in those *Sacrifices* must be interpreted to be a *Communion* with the *Father*, as communicating in the external *Sacrifices* was communicating both with the *Father* and the *Son*, because both of them were worshiped in those external *Sacrifices*. From thence results a further notion of *κοινωνία* usual in the Philosophy of that *Age*, as *κοινωνία* is taken for a participation in a *Society*, for an *Interestedness* in the *Wellfare* of it, and a *Right* to the *Privileges*, and the other *Benefits* consequential to it. And thus I have shewn that the *Popular Sacrifices* were designed for the confederation of *Nations*, and a consequent intitling to the *Deity* of those *Nations*, and the *Protection* and *Favor* expected from him. Answerably hereunto the *Invisible Mystical Sacrifices* were also supposed to confederate a *πολιτεύμα* of the *Heavenly Jerusalem* under a *Mystical Priesthood* of

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 215

of the Λόγος, and the Government and Chap. 8.
 Protection of the *Supreme Being*. And
 as the *Rights* of a *Nation* did most ap-
 pear in a *Right* in their *Panegyres*, a
Right of partaking in their *Suffrages* and
 their *Sacrifices*; so there were also sup-
 posed the *General Assemblies* of the *First*
born, who were (with God, the Judge Heb.XII.
 of all) to judge the *Earth*, in allusion to 23. ὡς
 the like *Judicatories* of the *Cities* of that *νῆξ*
Age which were generally *Democrati- is the word*
cal, where every free born Citizen there used.
 had a *Vote* in their *General Assemblies*, as a-
 mong the *Romans* they had in their *Co-*
mitia Centuriata and *Tributa*, and it was
 counted one of the *Rights* of *Citizenship*
 to admit them to it, and a *Diminutio*
Capitis, an *Infringement* of the same
Right of *Citizenship* to deprive them of
 it, in the same sense as the *Capite censi* are
 they whose *Estates* would not reach to
 any of the *Classes*, and who were there-
 fore only polled as *free Citizens*, and as
 the *Fees* payed on this account of admit-
 ting into the *City* are called κεφάλαιον,
Act. XXII. 28. Thus κοινωνία is used as
 a known Term of *Mystical Privilege* in
 the *Egyptian Philosophy* intituled to *Her-*
mes, from whence the *Hellenists* borrow-
 ed most of their *Notions*, and in a sense

Hermes ap.
 Stob. Eclo.
 Phys.

Chap. 8. very agreeable to that of the *Apostle* where he speaks of a κοινωνία with the *Father* and the *Son*. 1 Joh. I. 3. The Passage is remarkable, and not (that I know of) taken notice of to this purpose, and therefore worthy the more particular Observation: ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ

Mercur.

ἐκ τῆς

πρός

τὰτ ap.

Stob. Ec-

log. Phys.

L. I. p. 89.

Edit. *Au-*

rel. Allo-

brag. 1609.

ΔΕ ὅτι ψυχῶν· ἡ ΚΟΙΝΩΝΟΫΣΙ ΜΗ
ΑΙ Τῆς θεῶν ταῖς τῆς ἁνθρώπων, ΑΙ ἡ τῆς
ἁνθρώπων ταῖς τῶν ἀλόγων. ἐπιμελῆσαι ἡ
ΟΙ κρείττονες τῆς ἐλαττόνων, θεοὶ μὲν ἁνθρώ-
πων, ἄνθρωποι τῆς ἀλόγων ζώων, ὁ ἡ θεὸς
πάντων. Ὁ μὲν ἔν κόσμῳ ὑποκαίται τῶ
θεῷ, ὁ ἡ ἄνθρωπος τῶ κόσμῳ, τὰ ἡ ἀλογα
τῶ ἄνθρωπῳ, ὁ ἡ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα ἡ ὧς
πάντα. ΚΑΙ Τῆ μὲν θεοῦ κατὰπεραὶ ἀκτί-
νες ΑΙ ἐνέργειαι· Τῆ ἡ κόσμος ΑΙ ἀκτίνες ΑΙ
φύσεις. Τῆ ἡ ἄνθρωπος ΑΙ τέχναι, ἡ ΑΙ ἑπι-
σημαί. Καὶ ΑΙ μὲν ἐνεργεῖαν διὰ τοῦ κόσμου
ἐνεργῶσι, καὶ ἑπὶ τῶ ἁνθρώπου διὰ τῆς τοῦ
κόσμου φυσικῶν ἀκτίνων· ΑΙ ἡ φύσεις διὰ
τῆς σιχαίων· ΟΙ ἡ ἄνθρωποι διὰ τῆς τεχνῶν
καὶ ἑπισημαίων. Καὶ αὕτη ἡ τῆ παντὸς διοίκη-
σις ἡρημῶν ἐκ τῶ ἔΝΟ' Σ φύσεως, καὶ ἡ
διοίκουσα τῆ ἔΝΟ' Σ Τῆ ΝΟΥ'. Ὁ ἡ
ΝΟΥ' Σ ὅτι θειότερον καὶ ἐνεργέστερον καὶ

ΕΝΩ

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 217

ΕΝΩΤΙΚΩΝ ΤΕΡΟΝ, ἀνθρώπων μὴ πρὸς Chap. 8.

τὰς θεάς, θεῶν ὃ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους. And afterwards: διὰ τῶν τὰ πλνται ἡ δύο, κόσμος καὶ Ἀνθρώπους, ὑπὲρ ὃ τῶ ἔνω'ς πλνται.

WHETHERSOEVER of these Sect. 14.
ways this Term be understood, this κοινωνία will be proper to the Λόγῳ, and will be grounded on the *Mystical* ἑνωσις, as antecedent to it. If it be taken for a participation of the *Mystical Sacrifice*, and the great *Mystery*; then it will plainly depend on the Λόγῳ as the *High Priest* who was to offer that *Sacrifice*, and as the *Hierophanta* who was to preside in this *Mystery*. There could be no communicating at this invisible Altar without the permission of the *High Priest*, nor any access to this ἐποπτεία without the discovery of the *Hierophanta*. Nor indeed could any have any Right to them, unless he was first united to the Λόγῳ. The Λόγῳ could not μεσιτεύειν, so as to bring the Parties to any agreement without a Union to each of them. Without this it was impossible that he could unite them to each other, as it is impossible that any Glew can unite two Bodies that is not it self united to both of them. He could have

8. have no *Right* to the *Sacrifice* unless he be one of that *Society* to whom the *Sacrifices* did belong, nor could he be judged one of the *Assembly* who owned no *Union* with the *President* of the *Assembly*. Nor could he have a *Right* to the $\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\alpha$ of the *Chief God* without a *Union* with the *Hierophanta* as the *Representative God*. Consider it also as a *participation* in a *privileged Society*, and so he can have no *Title* to the *Privileges* of a *Society* who is not supposed to be a *Member* of it; nor can he be supposed to be a *Member* of it who does not partake in those *Bonds of Union* on which the *Unity* of the *Society* it self does depend. But the *Government* of the *Mystical Ferusalem*, and consequently the *presiding* in *Legal Assemblies*, for the *Exercise* of the *Government*, did wholly belong to him. He was supposed to be the *Pastor*, as *David* and *Cyrus* are called *Pastors*. He was supposed to be the *Mystical David* who was always to have a *Lamp* in this *Ferusalem*. And therefore still, by the consequence of all these Reasonings, it appears that *Union* is still supposed to *Communion*, and that therefore the $\Lambda\delta\gamma\Theta$, as the *Principle* of this *Mystical Union*, must needs have it in

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 219

in his Power to dispose also of the *Right Chap. 8.*
to *Mystical Communion.*

IT remains therefore that I shew, *Seet. 15.*
from the same Principles, that the
Λόγος was supposed to be the whole *Author* of this *Mystical Union*. This ap-
pears from the *Title* given the Λόγος in
that Philosophy. As they call the *Fa-
ther* the τὰ πρῶτον and the τὸ ὄν and the
ὅλος ὄν, so they call the Λόγος the τὸ ἐν,
as being the *first Unity*. And by the
Principles of that same Philosophy, the
first in every kind is supposed to be, not
only the *Copy*, but the *Cause*, of all other
Beings of the same kind. They suppo-
sed it to be but *one*, but yet to multiply
it self in *Representations*, as the *Seal* does
in *Wax* by diversity of *Impressions*. And
therefore as all other *Impressions* received
from the *Seal*, are not the *Seal* it self,
but only *likenesses* and resemblances; so
they made the *Archetypal Beings* only to
be the *True Beings*, and all *Derivatives*
to be only *Resemblances* of the *True*.
This they expressed by an artificial way
of speaking received among them.
When they expressed the *Archetypal
Beings*, they used the composition of
αὐτό, as αὐτοπαράγον, αὐτοάνδρων, &c.
But when the *Derivatives*, they use the
Termination

Chap. 8. Termination of εἶδης, as ἀγαθοειδης, ἀνδρα-
 ποειδης, &c. As therefore they make
 the ταλαθον the Principle from whence
 all the ἀγαθοειδης receive their Goodness;
 so, by the same Analogy of Speech and
 Reasoning, they must make the τὸ ἐν
 the Principle from whence all the
 εἰσοειδης, all that indeed are one by par-
 ticipation do derive their Unity. And as
 they make all Bodies one by the conso-
 nancy of their Motions, and their Sub-
 serviency to the Universe; so they do
 with much more reason make the Intel-
 lectual World, (which, as I shewed,
 was with them the Λόγος) one. The
 very Unity and Harmony of the Corporeal
 World was thought to be derived from
 him. He was thought συνέχεν and συ-
 φέρειν to contain the parts together.
 He was thought συναρμόζειν, to suit and
 proportion their Motions so to each o-
 ther that they should prove harmonious.
 He was thought to govern the whole
 World in the time when it was best go-
 verned, that is, in the time of the Golden
 Age, and all ill Government was ascri-
 bed to his leaving the Helm. He was
 thought ἐπιτάσσειν to give all inferior Be-
 ings their Essence, by imprinting the
 Ideas, nay, to be the very ἐπίστασις it self,

Plato Polit.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 221

τῶν ὅλων. For tho they called the ταλα- Chap. 8.

the τὸ ὄν and the ὄντι ὄν, yet withal they called him μὴ ὄν, because he did not εἰσῆσαι. And what can be more intimate to *Beings* than their *Essence*?

The very Phrases of the Apostle that of *Procl. Theol. Plat.*

him, and through him, and by him are all things, are the Language of that same Philosophy. But they are particularly careful of using that form of Speech, that all things are *in him*, rather than *he in all things*, lest they should seem to make him any where as in a place. Otherwise, as he was thought to be the *Intellectual Archetypal World*, so they deny not but that he is *in all things*.

THUS far they proceeded in advancing his power of uniting, even the sensible Sect. 16.

World. But they went further as to the *Intellectual World*, and as to the *Union* of *Intellectual Beings*. First as he was peculiarly the ΑΥΤΟΝΟΣ, so the εἰσῆσις of all other Νόες did particularly belong to him, not only on that general account whereby all *Ideas* were thought impressed by him, but by a particular *Right* as a derivation of his own *Property*. For tho the *Father* were also a Νός, yet the *Propagation* of Νόες was by the *Platonists* supposed to be from the κατὰ, which

was

Chap. 8. was at the disposal of the λόγος. At least the *Hellenists*, of whose Reasonings against their *SCHISMATICKS* I am now discoursing, gathered it from those Expressions of *Genesis*, where *Man* is said to be made κατ' εἰκόνα and κατ' ὁμοίωσιν Θεοῦ, according to the Image and Likeness of God, understanding the εἰκὼν, or Image of the λόγος, or Word. So *Philo*: εἰδὲν γὰρ ἐτέρῳ ὁμοειδέγγματι πρὶν εἰς ἡμέσας πρὸς τὴν κατὰσκευὴν αὐτῆς ἔσσεσθαι χρῆσθαι· μόνῳ δ', ὡς εἶπον, τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λόγῳ. Διὸ φησιν ἀποφθόνισμα καὶ μίμημα γυγνῆσθαι τῆτον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐμπνέοντα εἰς τὴν πρὸς ὡπον, &c. For it pleased him to make use of no other Copy of those inferior Beings for the making of them, but only his own WORD. Accordingly he calls the man breathed into the face of Adam the Image and Resemblance of God. And elsewhere more expressly: ἡ εἰκὼν ἄλλαν

Allegoriar:
L. II. 29.

γίνεται ὁμοειδέγγμα, ὡς καὶ ἐναρχόμενος τῆ νομοθεσίας ἐδήλωσεν εἰπὼν, καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ, ὡς τὸ μὲν εἰκόνος καὶ τὸ Θεὸν ἀποφθονοειδούς, τὸ δὲ ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα λαβέσσαν δύναμι, ὁμοειδέγγματι. The Image is the Pat-

tern

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 223

tern of the other things, as he [Moses] Chap. 8. implies in the very beginning of the Law, when he says, And God made Man after the Image of God, As if the Image indeed were Copied from God, but man was only made according to that Image which received the Power of its Copy. They further made this Unity of Intellectual Beings to be by an *ἑνισερχὴν* or Conversion of the inferior Intellects to the νοῦτοι or Ideas, which because they were supposed to be in the Λόγος, the *ἑνισερχὴν* caused by them must be supposed to be to him also. And this indeed was the proper way of restoring and uniting lapsed Intellects, of which I am now discoursing. Thus therefore the procuring and effecting all this Mystical Union and Communion was supposed to depend on the Λόγος.

Procl. Theol. Platon.

IT remains now that I shew further, 2. That Union and Communion with the Λόγος, was supposed to depend on External Communion with the High Priest, as one who particularly represented the Λόγος in this Office of Mystically signifying and causing this external Unity. It was to depend on the external Communion on the same account as the benefit of all Mysteries was supposed to depend

Sect. 17.

Chap. 8. pend on their *external Representations*, being every where understood to effect what they represented, as indeed all *Covenanting Symbols* were constantly supposed to do. The partaking therefore at the *visible Altar*, as it signified, so it conferred a *Right* to Communion with that which was *invisible*; as it signified their belonging to the *Community* confederated by the *External Sacrifices*, so it also conferred a *Right* to that *invisible Society* which was confederated by those *Mystical Sacrifices*, to which they could have no *Right* but by their *Right* to the *Society* confederated by them. Their *communicating* with the *High Priest* who was the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ in effigie, implied and gave a *Real Right* to Communion with the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ himself, especially considering it as a *Symbol* used by the consent and Institution of the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ himself in a *Covenant* wherein himself was a *Party* and a *Mediator*. The *High Priest* in this Office personated more than a *Human Nature*. So Phila:

De Monarch. L.
II. p. 828.
Ed. Græco-
Lat. Paris.
1640.

βέλεται γὰρ αὐτὸν ὁ νόμος μείζονος μεμια-
ρᾶσθαι φύσεως, ἢ καὶ ἀνθρώπου, ἐγλυτέρω
πρεσβόντα τῇ δέας, μεθόριον, εἰ δ' εἰ τὰ λη-
θεις λέγειν, ἀμφοῖν, ἵνα διὰ μέγας πνὸς

ἀνθρώποι

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 225

ἄνθρωποι μὴ ἰλάσκονται Θεόν. Δεῖς ὃ τὰς Chap. 8.

χρῆστας ἀνθρώποις ὑποδιακόνω τινὶ χρώ-
 μῳ ὁρέγῃ καὶ χρηγῇ. For the Law will
 have him to partake of a more than Hu-
 man Nature, approaching near to that of
 God, because he was to be (if we may say
 it with reverence) a common bound of both,
 that both men may by a Mediator appease
 the Deity, and God may use him as a Mi-
 nister in reaching out, and communicating
 his Graces unto men. What this more
 than Human Nature was appears from
 what he elsewhere tells us in the same
 Discourse, that the High Priest in his
 Vestments bore the Image of the Uni- P. 825.

verse, εἰκόνα τῷ παντὶ ἐμφανῇ. And
 that the Universe or World here spoken
 of included also the Intellectual World
 (which with him is the Λόγος) is also
 manifest from what follows concerning
 the Intercession wherein he conceives
 that World to joyn with the High Priest,
 which cannot be understood of any but
 the Λόγος. So he gives the reason
 why his Vestments were to represent the Ibid.
 whole World, ὅπως ἐν ταῖς ἱερουργίαις συλλή-

τρυγῇ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτοῦ. πρεπωδ' ἐσάτων ὃ
 τ' ἱερωμῆλον τὰ τῷ κόσμῳ παλεῖ, καὶ τ' ὑπὸ
 ἐπάγειται πρὸς δεξιῶν τῷ γεγυνηκότῳ.

Q

That

Chap. 8. *That the whole World might assist him in the performance of his Sacred Offices. It being indeed most becoming that he who was himself consecrated to the Father of the World, should also come accompanied with the Son to the Worship of him who had begotten him. This Son of God can be no other than that same Δόγῳ whom the Christians also called the Son of God, and to whom they also ascribed the same Office of Mediating with the Father, which is here ascribed to him by Philo. And this is the way by which Iamblicus endeavours to account for those Imperative Forms so frequently made use of by the Priests in their Mystical Commerce with Beings so much more excellent than themselves, that they herein personated a Being to whom the Duty was indeed due which they challenged in his name. The High Priest therefore, in this Action, being designed to represent the Δόγῳ as a Principle of external Unity, must, by the same Reasoning, give a Right to that Internal Mystical Union, which none but the Δόγῳ himself can give, but yet he must be supposed obliged to give, having given already a Right to it by this Legal way of Covenanting for it. And indeed in this particular*

De Myster.
Sect. IV.
c. 2.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 227

particular matter concerning *Unity*, Chap. 8. none could pretend so fairly for the *Unitive Office* of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ as the *High Priest*. For considering, as I said, that all that the *visible Priesthood* can contribute to the *Mystical Union*, is by the *Obligation* his *Act* may lay upon the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ in whose immediate Power it was conceived to be; and considering that the *Obligation* was to be gathered from the *signification* of the *Symbols* instituted by him, that what was *signified* by those *Symbols*, that he was understood to have obliged himself to *perform*, and therefore having instituted *Symbols* of *Unity*, he was understood to have obliged himself to *perform* that *Unity Mystically* which he had shadowed *externally*; it thence follows that this *external signification* was (as to us) the ground from whence we could conclude the *Obligation*. And therefore if the *signification* of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ as a *Principle* of *Unity* was most proper to the Office of the *High Priest*, it will follow that the *effecting* the *Mystical Unity*, answerable to the *visible Unity* by which it was represented, must have been most proper to *him* also. And that this was so, will appear, if we consider whence

Chap. 8. it was that this *Unity* was derived according to the *Hellenistical Hypothesis*. And the Apostle who seems frequently to allude to it, makes it to consist in the *Unity* of a *Head*. Thus Marriage makes a *Mystical Union* because the *Head of the Woman is the Man*; and *Christ and the Soul are One*, because the *Head of every Man is Christ*; and *Christ and God are One*, because the *Head of Christ is God*; and *Christ and the Church are One*, because he is the *Head of the Church*; and accordingly he is said συγκεφαλαιῶσαι πάντα εἰς ἓν, because he is the *Head of all Intellectual*, as well as *Sensible Beings*. But in this Office of being a *Head*, no *Priesthood* can pretend to represent him but the *High Priesthood*. And therefore none can (in this way of Reasoning) pretend so properly as that, to be a *Principle* of this *Mystical Unity*.

Eph. V. 23.

1 Cor. XI.

3.

C H A P. I X.

The Christian Bishops were answerable to the Jewish High Priests.

The CONTENTS.

The Solidity of this same way of Reasoning as urged by the Primitive Christians against their contemporary SCHISMATICKS. The general Principles on which they proceeded were granted by the Generality of that Age. Sect. I. The way of Reasoning from Sacrifices admitted also under the Gospel. Sect. II. The Reasoning from Mystical Sacrifices indeed most proper to the State of the Gospel. Sect. III. The Primitive Bishops designed in imitation of the Jewish High Priesthood. Hence the custom of their wearing Frontlets. Sect. IV. And that of their confining the Succession in Churches to the Family of their first Bishops. Sect. V. This Design very agreeable to the Change intended by our Saviour. Sect. VI. An Account why, for a

Q 3 *while.*

Chap. 9.

while, the Christians might defer the committing that eminency of Power into the Bishops hands with which they were intrusted afterwards. Sect. VII, VIII. Hence also the Absoluteness of particular Bishops in S. Cyprian's time. Sect. IX. However this same Reasoning will oblige all to a strict dependence who live within the same Jurisdiction. Sect. X. The same way of Reasoning from Jewish Precedents will include whole Cities within the same Jurisdiction. Sect. XI. How inclinable the Christians were to take up these Arts of Uniting Citizens. Sect. XII. The Solemn Anniversaries of the Jews being continued among the Christians were to be understood as Obligatory in the Times of Christianity; and their being observed in particular Cities implied that the Bishops of those Cities were answerable to the High Priests. Sect. XIII.

Sect. I.

THUS far I have explained the *Prudence* and *Solidity* of this Argument as insisted on by the *Jews* against the *Samaritans*, proceeding on the Popular Hypothesis received not only among

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 231

among the Philosophical *Heathens*, but *Chap. 9.*
the *Jews* themselves, especially the *Hel-*
lenists, and alluded to in all the remaining
Disputes in the like case in the *New Testa-*
ment. I now proceed further to shew
the like *Prudence* and *Solidity* of the
same Argument as applied to the Case
of *Christian SCHISMATICKS*
under the *New Testament*. And some
things have already been taken notice
of that will considerably prepare the
way. It has already been observed that
Christianity is nothing but a *Mystical*
Judaism, and that this *Affertion* that it
was so is the main thing endeavoured
to be proved in the *Discourses*, and the
Supposition that it was so is the main
Foundation supposed in the *Reasonings*
of the *New Testament*. It has been
observed further that this Hypothesis
is so confessed in the *New Testament*, as
that *Reasonings* are allowed from *Jewish*
Precedents to shew what ought to be un-
der *Christianity*, and that most of the
Reasonings in the *New Testament* for in-
troducing now, things proper to the *Chri-*
stian Religion, are indeed of that kind.
So far were they *then* from decrying
this as a *Legal Way of Reasoning*, as our
Brethren do *now*. It has likewise been

Chap. 9. observed that this agreeableness between *Judaism* and *Christianity*, or between the *Literal* and *Mystical Judaism*, held also in these very Particulars, that both of them were supposed to have a *Priesthood* and an *Altar*, I mean *visible*, as well as *invisible*; and that these *Priesthood* and *Altar* were to perform the same *Offices* with *Christians*, as they had done among the *Fews*, and accordingly that Reasonings were also allowed from the *Priesthood* and *Altar* among the *Fews*, to the *Mystical Priesthood* and *Altar* which were still kept up among the *Christians*, so that the *Fathers* in Reasoning thus did no more than what they could justify by allowable *Precedents* in the *New Testament*. This Reasoning will especially hold, where the *Design* aimed at is *common* to *Judaism* with *Christianity*, that there the *Means* of prosecuting that *same Design* should be also *proportionably* the *same*. And therefore seeing that the *Church* is still a *Society*, and that a *visible* one under a *visible Government* proper to it self, as the *Fews* were; and seeing that *external Peace* and *Unity* are not by any one pretended to be *antiquated* parts of *Judaism*, but are *still* as *seasonable*,
and

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 233

and as necessary for the subsistence of *Chap. 9.*
 such *Societies* as they were *then*; and
 that this way of keeping to the *external*
Communion of the *visible Priesthood* and
Altar of our *Christian Churches* are as
 conducive to the maintenance of *Peace*
 and *Unity now* as they were *then*: It
 plainly follows, that they ought *actually*
 to *contribute* to the same *Design* as they
 did *then*, That our *Mystical Priesthood*
 and *Altar* ought as firmly to be adhered
 to in order to the preserving our interest
 in the *Segullah now* as the *Fews* thought
 themselves obliged to adhere to theirs,
 for claiming the like *Privileges* of the
Segullah then.

BESIDES these things, it appears *Sect. 2.*
 likewise how many of the *Principles*
 then proceeded on are still as firmly be-
 lieved under the *Gospel*. The *Fews* made
 the *Privilege* of the *Segullah* to consist in
 the immediate *Worship* and *Patronage*
 of the *Supreme Being*, and his acceptance
 of that *Appropriation*. The *Christians*
 succeed the *Fews* in this very *Privilege*
 of *worshipping* the *Supreme Being*, and as
 succeeding them in the *Privilege* of be-
 ing the *Segullah*, they must succeed them
 also in the *Right* of having the *Patronage*
 of the *Supreme Being* appropriated to
 them,

Chap. 9. him, so that *none* but *Christians* now can pretend to it, not even the *Fews* themselves, but upon a condition, common to *them* with any *other Nations*, that of turning *Christians*. Their way of appropriating this *Worship* and *Patronage* to themselves was by their *Sacrifices* and their *Altar*. All the whole *Nation* of the *Fews* had a *Right* to partake of those *Sacrifices*, and by consequence to that *Patronage*; and none of any other *Nation*, whilst they kept their *National Distinctions*, had any *Right* to partake with them at their *Sacrifices*, tho they otherwise pretended to worship the same *Supreme Being*, and in the same way as they did. This was the Case of the *Samaritans*, *Ezr. I V. 2.* who yet were told that they had nothing to do with them, *Verse 3.* In excluding them from their *Sacrifices* they must needs deny their Title to the *Mystical Invisible Sacrifices*, and to that special *Patronage* of the *Supreme Being*, they denied them any portion in the *Holy One*. And we also have an *Altar*, of which the *Fews* themselves, as well as the *Heathens*, have no *Right* to partake, but on the condition of *Profelytism*, who therefore, by the same Reasoning, can have no *Right*

Heb. XIII.
10.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 235

Right to the Invisible Sacrifices, and our God. Their High Priest also was a Principle of Unity as he presided over their solemn Panegyres, and the Sacrifices then celebrated on that occasion, not as a Head of their Proseucha or Synagogues, or of those Assemblies wherein they met for the celebration of their ordinary Offices. And, by the same Reasoning, our Bishops ought to be Principles of Unity, not as presiding over Parishes and such subdivisions appointed for Ordinary Assemblies, but as presiding in those Assemblies which were common to whole Churches of one denomination, that is, as I have elsewhere shewn, of such as were Diocesans. Chap. 9.

BUT that which is peculiar in *our Sect.* 3. *Sacrifices* is that they are rather *Mysteries* than *Sacrifices*. The *Jewish Sacrifices* did indeed partake of both Offices. As *Popular Sacrifices* they appropriated a particular God to a particular People in order to *National and Temporal Benefits* expected from him, as *protection* of their secular Government, *Victory* over their Enemies, &c. For these were the things principally designed and expected by the *Popular Sacrifices* among the *Nations*. But as *Mysteries* they related

Chap. 9. related peculiarly to the *Mystical Invisible Sacrifice* of the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\Theta$, to the *Benefits of Souls*, and *Privileges in the Invisible Intellectual World*. And these were the peculiar and principal designs of our Saviour. His *Kingdom* was not to be of *this World*. As Man he was not to come in a Royal State of Magnificence here, but was to expect it after his death. As *Messias* he was to be *Prince of the World to come*. As $\Delta\omicron\gamma\Theta$ his *Dominion* was peculiarly in the *World of Spirits*, and his *Designs* were principally for rescuing captivated *Spirits* from the *Dominion of their Bodies*, and the *Confinement of the lower World*, which were also the principal designs of the *Mysteries*. And therefore here the Reasoning from the *Jewish Sacrifices* and *Priesthood* and *Altar* will peculiarly hold, if we consider them as *Mysteries*, ours being indeed no other than *Mystical Sacrifices*. *Christianity* it self being really nothing but *Mystical Judaism*, all the *Mystical Reasonings* concerning *Jewish Matters* will more properly relate to *Christianity*, and proceed more strongly concerning it, than they can concerning *Judaism* it self. Besides the *Notions of Mystical Union and Communion*, on which these

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 237

these Reasonings against *SCHISM* are *Chap. 9.*
grounded, do peculiarly concern our
Mystical Sacrifices as they are *Mystical*.
Now *Christianity*, in the Reasonings of
the New Testament, is still represented
as the *Mystery kept hidden from Ages and*
Generations, that was first revealed in the
Gospel, that is, as the *Mystery* that had
formerly been shadowed by the most
sacred of the *Jewish Mysteries*, in which
regard it was very properly called the
Great Mystery, as that Term was also
used by the *Hellenists*. And in this re-
gard the *Revelation* of such a *Mystery* as
this was most proper for the *Αὐτός* him-
self. By the Laws of *Mysteries* the
ἑξουσία of such a *Mystery* as this, with-
out his Authority, had been extremely
Piacular for any Creature. Whence it
will follow further both that this proper
way of Reasoning in *Mysteries* is indeed
most proper and natural and cogent in a
Religion so made up of *Mysteries*, espe-
cially in the *Sacraments*, which are yet
further the most *Sacred Mysteries* of this
most *Mysterious Religion*; and withal
that the *Benefits* of *Mysteries* (which,
according to the received Notions of that
Age, would have been expected from
Mysteries, wherein undoubtedly the
Holy

Philo Alle-
gor. Leg. L.
II. p. 79. D.

Chap. 9. *Holy Ghost* would not fail their expectations, especially such as were so prudently and naturally grounded) might be expected *here*, where the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\Theta$ himself, the great Author of *Mysteries*, and the proper performer of what was *Covenanted* for by *Mysterious Representations*, was so nearly and immediately concerned. And therefore if upon the *Union* of the *High Priest* with the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\Theta$, as represented by *him*, they were cut off from the *Internal Unitive Power* of the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\Theta$ who were cut off from the *visible Communion* of the *High Priest*; then much more we have reason to expect that they should *lose* their *Union* with the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\Theta$ now under the *Gospel* who are *separated* from the *Communion* of the *Bishop*, who *now* holds the same place, and performs the same Office as the *High Priest* did *then*; but withal does it in a *Constitution* of which the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\Theta$ is more professedly, and designedly, the principal *Author*, and the *Person represented*.

Sect. 4.

THIS Reasoning will hold as it is drawn from the *Precedent* of the *Law*, as it was intended by the *Ancients*. As I have shewn that no *other Priests* but the *High Priests* were concerned in this
Privilege

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 239

Privilege of being the Principle of Unity; Chap. 9.

so, under the Gospel, none but the Bishop could pretend to answer the Office of the High Priest: As the High Priest was a Principle of Unity as representing the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ in the Notion of a Head over the other Priests; so the Bishop alone answered both the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$, and the High Priesthood too, in being a visible Head over his Brethren of the Presbytery. And that the Primitive Christians understood their Bishop to answer the Office of the High Priest, appears in that, in the most ancient times, and in the best Records of those Churches which were most certainly planted in the Apostolical Times (if not by the Apostles themselves, in their own Persons) the Bishops were said to have worn the Sacerdotal Frontlet which was proper to the High Priest among the Jews, from whom in all likelihood they borrowed it. So Polycrates in his Epistle concerning the Paschal Controversie, concerning S. John, $\delta\varsigma \epsilon\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\iota \iota\epsilon\rho\delta\upsilon\varsigma \tau\omicron \pi\epsilon\iota\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu \pi\epsilon\phi\omicron\rho\eta\kappa\omega\varsigma$, &c. *Who was a Priest, and wore the Frontlet.* He could not pretend to the $\pi\epsilon\iota\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$ on account of an Ordinary Priesthood among the Jews, and there is no pretence of his being High Priest.

Ap. Euseb.
Eccl. Hist.
V. 24. III.
31.

Chap. 9. *Priest.* And therefore, in all likelihood, his pretence to it was on account of the Office in the *Christian Church*, which he thought equivalent to the *High Priesthood* among the *Jews*. Besides what he had done, by virtue of any Office among the *Jews*, must have been agreeable to the Constitutions of the *Priesthood* of the *Literal Judaism*, which would not have recommended his Example as so argumentative in *Christianity* for the keeping of *Easter*, whose Arguments from *Jewish Precedents* were not for the *same things*, but for things *answerable* to them in the *same proportion*. The same thing is delivered concerning *S. James* the first Bishop of *Jerusalem* by *Epiphanius*. A like passage there is concerning *S. Mark* produced out of an ancient *Manuscript* of his Passion by *Valesius*, tho, it is very true, the Author understands it of his *Priesthood* among the *Jews*. His Words are these: *Quem quidem B. Marcum juxta ritum carnalis Sacrificii Pontificalis apicis petalum in populo gestasse Judaeorum, illustrium virorum Syngrapha declarant. Ex quo manifeste datur intelligi, de stirpe eum Leviticâ, immo Pontificis Aaron, sacra successionis originem habuisse.* But we may easily distinguish

Epiphan.

Har.

LXXVIII.

Nazar.

Vales. in

loc. Euseb.

H.E.V.24.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 241

distinguish between the bare matter of *Fact*, and the Author's *conjecture* concerning the *occasion* of it. As for the *later*, we have no more reason to receive it than we have to value the *Judgment* and *Reason* of the Author. But for the matter of *Fact* it self he gives us more competent Testimonies than his own, the *Syngraphæ Virorum Illustrum*. Nor can it be thought strange; that what was really done by S. Mark as a *Christian Bishop* in those *first times*, this Author, because he found it used by no *Bishop* in his *own time*, might ascribe it to a *Jewish Priesthood*. But *Valesius* himself is of another opinion, and conceives it to have been used *ordinarily* by the *Bishops* of those *first times* as equivalent to the *High Priests* of the *Jews*. Chap. 9.

AND probably it is to this same *Sect. 5.* account, that the *Christian Episcopacy* was *then* thought answerable to the *High Priesthood* of the *Jews*, that we may most prudently ascribe that most ancient custom of chusing their *first Bishops* of the *same Family* with the *first* who had possessed the Chair at the time of their *first Conversion*. And among the *Jews* themselves the *Person* was
R elective,

Chap. 9. *elective*, tho the Election was indeed confined to the *Family of Aaron*. That the most *ancient Christians*, who lived nearest to the *Apostles*, did observe this way, we have reason to believe from the most ancient Monuments we have of *Ecclesiastical History*. In the Church of *Ferusalem*, where our *Saviour* was himself in person the principal *Converter*, the first *Bishops* were chosen of our *Saviour's Family*. First *S. James* (a) the *Just*, who because of his Relation, is in a general sense called *The Brother of our Lord*. Then *Simeon* (b) *Cleopha* the *Cousin German* of our *Saviour*, for *Cleophas* was the *Brother of Joseph*, if we may believe the Tradition of *Hegesippus*. And in this later *Election* it is particularly observed (c) that the *Apostles* had a particular regard to the *Counsel* and *Assistance* of the surviving *Kinsmen* of our

(a) Vide
Hegesip. ap.
Euseb. Eccl.
Hist. II. 23.

(b) Hegesip.
ap. Euseb.
Eccl. Hist.
III. 11.

ΜΕΤΑ ΤΟ
ΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΩ-
ΣΑΙ ἸΑ-
ΚΩΒΟΝ ὁ
ΔΙΔΑΧΟΝ

ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ἔπι ταῖς αὐταῖς λόγοις, πάλιν ὁ ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐ-
τῶν Συμεὼν ὁ τῷ Κλωπᾷ καθεζόμενος ἑπὶ σκοπῷ·
ὃν περ ἐδέοντο πάντες ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τῷ Κυρίῳ δ' ἄλλον.

The Words of *Hegesippus* ap. *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. IV. 22.* That is, After *James the Just* had suffered *Martyrdom*, as also our *Lord* himself had suffered on the same Account, the Son of his uncle, *Simeon of Cleophas* was made *Bishop*, to whom all gave their *Suffrages* the rather because he was the second *Cousin* of the *Lord*. *Epiphani. Hæc. LXXVIII. 7. 14.* (c) *Eusebius, Ibid.*

Saviour.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 243

Saviour. Among the *Brethren* of our *Chap. 9.*
Lord, Judas is reckoned for one. And
 his Posterity, *Hegesippus* says, presided
 over the *whole Church* as *Witnesses* and
Kinsmen of our *Lord*: His Words are
 very full: Ἐρχοῦνται ἐν ἡμῖν πενήντης πάλαι
 ἐκκλησίας ὡς μαρτυρεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ
 κυρίου. It seems then they were thought
 to have a *Right* to *preside* over the *whole*
Church, on account of their being *Kins-*
men to *him* by whom the *Church* was
 first constituted. The same thing he
 has also elsewhere, only there he says
 they did ἐγχορτασθαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, and for
 the same Reasons as before. Possibly
Eusebius understood it of their being
Bishops, but he is there to be explained
 by the Words of *Hegesippus* which were
 as I have now transcribed them. Nor
 was it only so in our *Saviour's Case*, who
 had a *Right* over the *whole Church*.
 There is reason to believe that the same
 Rule was also observed in other *particu-*
lar Churches besides that of *Jerusalem*.
 The forementioned *Polycrates* derives
 his Tradition for their way of observing
 of *Easter* from his own *Kinsmen*, of
 whom *seven* had been *Bishops* before
him, and himself the *eighth*. In all like-
 lyhood he means that they were his *Pre-*

Hegesipp. ap.
Euseb. Eccl.
Hist. III.
31. &c. 26.

Chap. 9. *decessors* in the same *See*, and accordingly he mentions only *some* of them with whom he had conversed, tho he was sixty five years old at the writing of the *Epistle*. The *Succession* of those *seven Bishops* before him in the same *See* might very probably come *near* the *time* of the *Apostles*. And considering that he insists on *their Testimony* as an Argument for proving an *Apostolical Tradition*, it must needs have been that the *first* of them lived in fresh memory of the *Apostles*. This way of Reasoning alone is agreeable to the *Practice* of the *Churches* of that *Age* in proving the *Doctrine* and *Consent* of the *Apostles* against their *contemporary Hereticks*. They prove them indeed by the *Testimony* of *Ecclesiastical Tradition*. But then they insist on no *Testimony* of any *Church* as competent for this purpose, but of those alone which had at first *received* their *Traditions* immediately from the *Apostles* themselves in *person*, and insist on no *Succession* of *Bishops* as competent for deducing such a *Testimony* to their *own Times*, but only such *Successions* whereof the *first* were *contemporary* with the *Apostles* themselves, that such *Bishops* might receive their *Traditions* immediately

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 245

mediately from the *Apostles* as well as *Chap. 9.* their *Churches*, lest otherwise their Adversaries might have had any plausible colour to *except* against the competency of their *first Information*. Thus that Argument is managed by *S. Irenaus* and *Tertullian*, the best present *Monuments* we have of the way of *Reasoning* of those times. So that this custom also of deriving the *Succession* in a *Family* seems also to have been derived from the times of the *Apostles*. And this way of imputing it to a *Jewish Original*, as an imitation of their way of deriving the *High Priesthood*, seems to be the most probable way of giving an account of it.

AND indeed this Reasoning where- *Sect. 6.*
by the *Christian Episcopacy* was made answerable to the *High Priesthood* of the *Jews*, is no more than what is very agreeable to the *Change* our *Saviour* intended to make, as we have an account of his Design in his own Discourse with the *Woman* of *Samaria*. He there tells her that *the time was coming, when they should neither in that mountain of Gerizim, nor yet in Jerusalem, worship the Father*. How so? That it should be unlawful to worship God at *Mount Gerizim*, or at *Jerusalem*? No, but that, according

*S. Joh. IV.
21.*

Chap. 9. cording to the agreement of both Parties in that Dispute, that the publick *solemn Worship* under the *personal* Management of the *High Priest* was confined as the *Samaritans* thought to *Mount Gerizim*, as the *Jews* thought to *Ferusalem*; the very Foundation of that Dispute should be quite taken away, that *Worship* of the *High Priesthood* should be no more confined, neither to *Mount Gerizim*, nor yet to *Ferusalem*. Plainly he must still be supposed to mean the *thing* he discourses of, in the *meaning* of the *Parties* concerned in that Dispute, allowing only the liberty of *Mysticizing* it so far as the *Gospel* it self required that it should be *mystically* understood. The Question therefore, between the *Jews* and the *Samaritans*, being concerning the *Confinement* of the *High Priesthood*, our *Saviour's* Answer must be understood to *deny* the *Confinement* of that which should be answerable to the *High Priesthood* under the *Gospel*. This must be the meaning of the Reason drawn from the *Spiritual Nature* of *God*, and the *spiritual way* of *worshiping* him. Not as our *Enthusiasts* are apt to understand it, that there should be no need of *Priests* nor *Sacrifices* (that

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 247

(that were to overthrow his own Con-stitutions under the Gospel it self elsewhere) but supposing the continuance of the *High Priesthood* and such *mystical Sacrifices* as the Gospel allows of, to let them know however, that they should henceforth be so *spiritual*, as that all who did communicate in the *same spirit*, how distant soever their *Residences* were, might notwithstanding communicate in *them*, which they could not do before. And still it is to be understood, not of *single Congregations*, but of the *Congregations*, at least, of *whole Cities* (for those *publick Sacrifices*, wherein the *High Priests* were concerned, were never designed for *less* than the *whole Cities*, how *great* and *populous* soever, where they were performed) that every *City* should have the same *Privilege* as *Sichem* and *Ferusalem*, to have *Mystical Sacrifices* and *High Priests* of their own, with whom they might communicate without such tedious *Journies* as they of the *Dispersion* were fain to make at the return of their solemn *Anniversaries* at *Ferusalem*. And tho then the *Samaritans* were guilty of *SCHISM* for erecting a new *Temple* and *Altar* and *High Priest* in a *distinct City*, and at a

Chap. 9. distance from *Ferusalem* ; yet henceforward the like Charge should not hold. *Distant Cities* might have their particular *High Priests* and *Sacrifices* without any such breach of *Unity* and *Peace* between them. All this while this Dispute was between *Cities*, not *single Congregations*. And the liberty of having particular *High Priests* must therefore be understood at least of *whole Cities*, in which nothing bore such a natural resemblance to the *Jewish High Priest* as their *Bishops*.

Sect. 7. PROBABLY this might have been the Reason why, during the first times of the *Apostles*, they did for a while forbear the setting any *Bishop* up in any considerable *Superiority* over his *Brethren*. Tho by the most creditable accounts of the *later times* of the *Apostles*, we have reason to believe that it was done by the *last surviving Apostles* ; yet we have here a prudent Reason, why, for some time, it should be forborn. If this *Superiority* of the *Bishop* were a substituting him in the place of the *High Priest*, and the multiplying such *Superiors* in *several Cities* were the multiplying *High Priests* in the *several Cities* ; it plainly appears how this must have

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 249

have been interpreted by those who *Chap. 9.*
were *Jewishly* affected, from the Principles already mentioned. They must have looked on such persons as, not only *violaters* of their *Law*, but as *Breakers* of their *Mystical Union*, and consequently obnoxious to the same Curses and Execrations which on the same account had been thundered against the *Samaritans*. And therefore as in other Cases we find them very cautious of giving any *Offence* to the * *Jews*, tho' * 1 Cor.X. otherwise *justifiable* by their own *Principles*,^{32.} till they found the *Generality* prepared for them, or they were forced upon them by some *Exigencies* of their *Circumstances*; so we have reason to believe that they proceeded with the measures of calm *Prudence*. Whilst they could, they kept in the *Communion* of the *Jewish Church*, they *worshipped* in the *Temple*, and attended their *Anniversary Assemblies*, till the *Jews* themselves seem to have *driven* them from them, which it should seem they did not till the *later end* of the *Apostles times*. Whilst they kept this correspondence with them there was no reason to expect that they would raise up the jealousy of the *Jewish High Priest* by setting up a
Rival

Chap. 9. Rival against him. Nay, by *S. Paul's* behaviour to him whilst he was on the *Tribunal* judging him, and provoking him by unbecoming and unequal behaviour, it appears what a deference the *Christians* themselves payed to the *Jewish High Priesthood* of those times, besides the exprefs Command our Saviour himself gave to observe and do what should be required from them by those who *sate on Moses seat*.

Acts.
XXIII. 5.

S. Matth.
XXIII.
2, 3.

Sett. 8. T H U S far therefore they, for a while, exercised no *Government* at all, but acted by the Principles then allowed in favor of *Zealots* and *Prophets*. And it is observable how low that Passage concerning *S. Paul* reaches into the *Apostles Times*. When they did find it requisite for their own sakes to set up an *Ecclesiastical Government*, yet still they did it by Principles allowable by the *Jews*. Among the *Jews* themselves the *Synagogue-Way* of Worship was allowed in *all places*, at whatsoever distance from *Jerusalem*, and among them they had their *Rulers* in common, and some, as it should seem, over the rest, whom they called their *Archisynagogue*, which none understood to be done with the least design of emulation

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 251

lation against the *High Priest*. This *Chap. 9*
therefore the *Christians* might imitate
without offence, without pretending any
design of making themselves a *distinct*
Body. And this liberty they seem to
have taken, allowing their *first Presby-*
ters no more preheminance than what
was allowed to the *Archisynagogus*.
Afterwards when the *Old Testament*
Texts were thorowly understood which
were applyed by them to the *Eucharist*,
by which it appeared to be, not only a
Commemoration of our *Saviour's Death*,
but also a *Mystical Sacrifice*, the *Sacrifice*
indeed that was *prefigured* and *typified* by
the *Jewish Sacrifices*, and which was to
succeed, and *supersede* them in the State
of *Mystical Israelitism*, and to take
them off from all *Obligations* of attend-
ing and communicating in their *bloody*
Sacrifices; then it appeared to tend to a
breach from those who still maintained
the *Obligation* of the *Levitical Sacrifices*.
And when the *Jewish Sacrifices* and
High Priesthood were taken away, and
past all hopes of restitution; then the
Jews themselves who had been profely-
ted to the *Christian Religion* upon those
other Principles that were not con-
demnable by *Judaism* it self, would now
undoubtedly

Chap. 9. undoubtedly be more favorable and willing to receive Conviction by what their Brethren had to say for the *continuance* of the *Mystical High Priesthood* as well as their *Mystical Sacrifices*. For this must have extremely conduced to the *comforting* them for the *Ruine* of their *Temple* and *Priesthood*, when they might yet enjoy their *Sacrifices* and *Priesthood* (which had been the greatest *endearment* of *Jerusalem* to them) every where else more *fully* and *effectually* than they did at *Jerusalem*. Nay, so far would it be from being *scandalous* now, that more than formerly, must, on these very accounts, be *favorably* affected to *Christianity*. And upon this account it was *seasonable* to advance the *preheminance* of the *Bishop*, when he was to *succeed* in the *Office* of *High Priesthood* by the true *Principles* of *Christianity*, as we have all the reason we can desire from the footsteps of those times, to believe that it was indeed, about this time, considerably advanced.

Seet. 9. AND this seems also very agreeable with that *absoluteness* of *Episcopacy* so much insisted on by *S. Cyprian*, who most of all insists on this Argument we are discoursing of against the SCHIS-

MATICKS

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 253

MATICKS of his time. He makes *Chap. 9.*
all *Bishops* equal, to have the whole
Power *in solidum*; to be absolute *Judges*
of their *own Acts*, and to be accountable
to none but *God*, and that there was but
one *Episcopacy* among them all, which
notwithstanding was possessed by each
of them not in *parcels*, but *intirely*. It
is easie to observe how inconsistent this
is with that *Supremacy* which is challen-
ged by the *Pope* over all the other *Bi-*
shops of the World. Had the Case been
so, the *Pope* alone had been the *only* Suc-
cessor into the *High Priesthood*, and
there had been no other change under
the *Gospel* but that of the *Seat* of
the *High Priesthood*, that it had been
translated from *Ferusalem* to *Rome*.
Still the *confinement* had been continued,
whereas, on the contrary, it is the prin-
cipal design of our Saviour's Discourse
to overthrow the *Perpetuity* of that *Con-*
finement, as well on the *Jews* side, as on
that of the *Samaritans*, as well to *Feru-*
salem as to Mount *Gerizim*, and conse-
quently as well to *Rome*, as to *Ferusa-*
lem: And in order hereunto he shews,
in his Discourse with the Woman of
Samaria, that henceforward all other
places like *Samaria* and *Ferusalem*, that
is,

Chap. 9. is, all *Cities*, should have equal Privileges with those which were, at that time, actually challenged by *them*, which was of being the *Supreme Metropolis of Religion*, which is, by no means consistent with that *Superiority* which is challenged by the *Roman Church* over other *Churches*. The most ancient *Metropolitane Rights* pretended to by the *Primitive Christians* were not of any real *Jurisdiction*, but only of *Rank and Order*. Now this *Absoluteness* of particular *Bishops* so much insisted on by *S. Cyprian*, as it is inconsistent with these pretences of the *Bishop of Rome*; so it is withal very consequent to the Notion I am speaking of, that the *Bishop* succeeded into the Office of the *High Priesthood*. For as the *High Priesthood* was so *supreme* as to have no *sacred Power* on *Earth* above it; so also must the *Christian Episcopacy*, if it succeeded the *High Priesthood* in the *plenitude of Power*. And as the *Reason* insisted on for the *One Altar of the Jews*, was that *one only God* was *worshipped* by it, and that *One only Mystical Altar and Sacrifice* of the Λόγος was *represented* by it, and so proportionably the *Reason* requiring the *Unity* of the *High Priesthood*, must also
be

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 255

be because the λόγος ἀρχαῖος. represented by *him* was only *One*; these are reasons also concerning *Christianity*, and explain the *Unity* of the *Catholick Church* now as well as *then*. For neither do we now pretend to any more than *One Mystical Sacrifice* performed by *Christ*, tho represented in our *several Eucharists*, nor to any more than *One Invisible Bishop Christ* himself as represented by *all our Bishops*. So that this is a way to understand how all the true *Churches* in the *World* do, notwithstanding, make no more than *One Church*, as all the *Altars* are only *One Altar*, and all the *Bishops* only *One Bishop*. Even the *Jews* themselves did not so insist on the *Personal Unity* of the *High Priest* as upon the *Uniformity* of their *Solemn Assemblies*. It was by accident that the *President* of their *visible Assemblies* was but *One*, because their *publick Assemblies* were confined to *one place*. Otherwise, even in that *one place*, there might be more *High Priests* than *One* if they acted uniformly and with consent, that is, so that the same *publick Assemblies* were owned by them, and managed so that *One* single Person presided in *each* of them. So did *Zadoc* and *Abiathar*: so did

Chap. 9.

Chap. 9. did the *first* and *second High Priest*:
2 Kings, XXV. 18. So seem *Annas* and
Caiaphas to have enjoyed that *same Office*
 at the *same time*. And the *Rabbins* tell
 us that the *High Priests* had in course
 their *Segen*, who was to officiate for him
 in case of *pollution*, or any such *unexpected*
Incapacity in him whose *principal Duty*
 it was. And in the *same way* neither
 did the *Primitive Christians* scruple the
 having *several Bishops* in the *same Cities*.
 So were *Narcissus* and *Alexander* at the
 same time *Bishops* of *Ferusalem*, and *S.*
Augustine and his Predecessor *Valerius*
 at the same times *Bishops* of *Hippo*,
 and it was proffered by the *Catholick*
Bishops to the *Donatists* as an *Expedient*
 for *Catholick Unity*, that, during life,
 both the *Catholick* and *Donatist Bishops*
 should both enjoy the *Honor* and *Stile* of
Bishops where there were two already
 made in the *same Sees*, on condition that
both parties might own the *Surviver*. And
 of this kind indeed are all the *uncensured*
Instances produced by a late Author who
 has collected all the *Instances* he could
 think of, of *many Bishops* in *One City*.
 This therefore being supposed, it easily
 appears how the *Christians* multiplying
 their *High Priests* in *several places* was
 justifiable

Collat.
 Carthag.

No Evid.
 for Dioces.
 Churches,
 &c. in the
 the *Primi-*
tive Times.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 257

Chap. 9.

justifiable from *SCHISM* by the very *Reasonings* of the *Jews* against the *Samaritans*. It had not been more repugnant to *Unity* for the *Samaritans* to have had a *distinct High Priest* from the *Jews* (if the *High Priests Office* might lawfully have been performed among the *Samaritans*) than it was for the *Jews* to have two at once at *Jerusalem*. So that the whole charge of *SCHISM* on both sides, was grounded on that supposition, which was also granted on both sides, that those *Assemblies* in which the *High Priest* was to *preside*, could not be *lawful* in any more than one place. And therefore *this* was also the only scruple those first *Judaizing Christians* could have against the *Christians multiplying their High Priests in several Cities*. When it once appeared that this *Worship of God in Panegyres with Solemn Mystical Sacrifices* was *lawful* in all other *Cities* as well as *Jerusalem*, by the *Rules of Mystical Israelitism*; it would also appear that such *multiplying their High Priests* were no more a *violation of Unity*, or prejudicial to their *representing the Λόγος as a Principle of Unity*, than it was that the *same Face* should be represented in *different Glasses*, or the *same*

S

Effigies

Chap. 9. *Effigies* taken off from the *same Seal* in *different Impressions*. And therefore as those two *Priests* in *Jerusalem* were, notwithstanding, *unprejudicial* to their *Unity* whilst they acted by *consent*, and without *prejudice* to the *Right* of *presiding* in the *common Assemblies*; so neither could they charge the *multitude* of *Bishops* in *several Cities*, with being *injurious* to the *Unity* of *Christian Communion*.

Seet. 10. BUT tho this *Reasoning* from the *Legal Precedent* of the *Unity* of the *High Priesthood* did not charge the *difference* or *mutual independency* of *Christian High-Priesthoods* in *different Cities* with *SCHISM*; yet it does not thence follow but that it may hold as the *Fathers* of the *first Centuries* managed it, against *several* or *independent Presidents* of the *same Cities* and *Jurisdications*. It is very true, where the *Multitudes* are not obliged to meet in *common Assemblies*, or not to maintain *visible Communion* in their own *Persons*; there the same *invisible Λόγος* may be represented by *several visible Bishops*. But it is withal as true, and as true by the *Consequent* of this *same Reasoning*, that where persons are obliged to the *same common Assemblies*, there

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 259

there it must *cut off* from the *Mystical Chap. 9.*
Unity with the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ to disown their de-
pendence on the *same visible* Representa-
tion of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ as the *Head* of their
visible Assemblies. For here the *same*
Reasoning holds exactly. The Argu-
ment of the *Jews* against the *Samari-*
tans was plainly to prove their *Obliga-*
tion to the *external Priesthood* at *Ferusa-*
lem, and from their *disunion* from him,
to infer their *disunion* from the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$
also, their *invisible High Priest.* The
Principles they proceeded on were, as we
have seen, that the *external Communion*
was the only *ordinary means* of attaining
the *internal Communion,* the *external Al-*
tar of the *Mystical Altar,* the *external*
Priesthood of the *Mystical Priesthood,* and
that therefore they who were *cut off*
from the *external Communion* with the
external Altar, and the *external Priest-*
hood, must also be *cut off* from the *internal*
Communion with the *Mystical Altar* and
Priesthood. Tho therefore it was not
against *Unity* for the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ to have dif-
ferent persons to represent him; yet it
was supposed to be against *Unity* for any
one to presume to represent the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$
who did not derive his *Power of Repre-*
sentation from them to whom the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$

Chap. 9. had in an *external* way committed the *Power* of deriving it, or against the *Rules* by which the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{C}$ had given them warrant to expect it, as there could be no giving it whilst the place of the *High Priesthood* was full, without the consent of the *High Priest*, or his removal by them who had *Power* to remove him; nor, even so, was there any reason to expect it any where but at *Ferusalem* after *God* himself had been pleased to confine the *Office* to that place. What was so pretended to must therefore have been against *Unity*, because it could not be expected by the *first Constitutions* for *Succession* in that *Office*, and for excluding false *Pretenders*, and for *Preservation* of *Unity*. And was not this whole Reasoning as cogent in the case of *Christian SCHISMATICKS*? Did *God* provide greater *Obligations* to secure a dependence on the *Priesthood* of the *Law* than that of the *Gospel*? Is it credible that the *Spiritual Benefits* gained by that dependence were greater, or the *Spiritual Loss* incurred by denying that dependence more tolerable, than those which are the *Rewards* and *Punishments* of the like Cases now? Can our *Altar* and *Priesthood* be *Mysteries* to them as shadowed

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 261

shadowed by their Altar and Prtesthood? Chap. 9.

And must they not therefore have a *nearer Relation* to the *Original Heavenly Mysteries*? Have not we a *nearer* and more *immediate* Interest in the *Λόγος*, and his *Sacrifice*, and *Intercession*, and *Heavenly Ministration*? And have we yet less efficacy in the conveyance of his *Invisible* and *Heavenly Influences*? Or is it probable that *God* should less *confine* his *Mystical Favors* to his external Ordinances *now* than under the *Law*? If *God* did not *confine* them *then*, why must the *Samaritans* lose them for losing their *Union* to the *Levitical Priesthood*? If he does also *now*, how can *SCHISMATICKS* come by them *now* who are *divided* from the *Priesthood* of the *Gospel*? I am sure the *Apostle* in his *Reasoning* in the *Epistle* to the *Ebrians* makes both the *Benefits* and *losses* greater which are gained and incurred by a *Reverence* or *Contempt* of *Gospel-Ordinances*. And how suitable his *Reasoning* is to the *Principles* from whence he reasons, let even our *Adversaries* themselves judge, who they should have less *Reverence*, than I believe they will, for his *Authority*.

Heb. II. 3.

I DO not see how they can avoid Sect. 11.

Chap. 9. the force of this Reasoning in such Cases where God has confined Us to certain Assemblies as he did all them to the Assemblies at Jerusalem. But how, will they say, does it appear that God has obliged all the Believers of a City and it's Jurisdiction to partake in the Assemblies of the Bishop? By the very same way of Reasoning from the Levitical Precedents. For this is also one Rule of this way of Reasoning, that the Legal Precedent must still oblige where there is not some other express Testimony, or Reason of the thing, to oppose against it. So the Law of Literal Sacrifices they opposed with those express Texts, where God expressed his dislike of their Literal Sacrifices, and his approbation of the Mystical. And so concerning the Sabbath, our Saviour himself pleads the Reason of Necessity, and the approbation of this Reason by the Law it self, by whose Prescriptions the Priests themselves broke the Law of the Sabbath in the Temple, and were blameless. But never is it any where pretended by the Apostles, or Apostolical Writers, as our Brethren usually pretend, that any thing is therefore not obligatory because it had no other Obligation besides that of the Old Law.

Nay,

Psalm. L. 8.
13, 14.
Lk. 16, 17.
Mt. I. 11, 12,
13, 14.

S. Matth.
XII. 5.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 263

Nay, by this Topick of Reasoning it is generally supposed that in all *other Cases* the *Legal Precedent* is still *obligatory*. And therefore this *Law* also of *confining* People to *Publick Assemblies* must still hold where no particular inconvenience does hinder it, and our Saviours *Relaxation* of it must only hold in those other Cases wherein there are such *particular inconveniences* as may be *judged* inconveniences by the Principles of the *Gospel*. Thus it was indeed an *inconvenience* that where *all Nations* were counted *equal*, and had an *equal Title* to be admitted to the *Privileges* of the *Gospel*, without any obligation further to leave either their *Countries* or their *Customs*, that yet the *Publick Worship* should be *confined* to *one place*, which therefore all other *distant places* of the *whole World* (which was now designed to be converted) must want for no other reason but their *distance*. For this looked like an *owning* that Principle which it is the principal design of the *Gospel* to *overthrow*, of the *confinement* of the *Segullah* to a *particular Nation*. And it was but agreeable to this Evangelical Disowning that *περσωνπολιμια*, that as *all Nations* were in their *own Countries*, equally capable

Chap. 9.

Chap. 9. of being admitted to the *Segullah*; so they should enjoy equal Privileges, the Privileges of the *Jews Temple-Worship*, as well as those of the *Synagogue-Worship*, and of the two rather those of the *Temple-Worship*, which were of God's exprefs Institution, than those of the *Synagogue-Worship*, which seem to have been taken up by *Human Prudence*. The Communication of these Peculiarities of God's Institution would rather signifie that God did not intend, henceforward, any such Confinement of his favor to a particular Nation, but that all should share alike in his *Evangelical Favors*. The inconvenience therefore following on this was that all other Nations and Cities, who could not ordinarily meet in those Assemblies, must ordinarily want the Benefit of such Assemblies, and constantly, if they did not take more painful Fournies for the sake of their Religion than they were obliged to on account of their *Worldly Concernments*.

Sect. 12. BUT neither did this Reason, nor this Inconvenience, hold in the Case of particular Cities. The Obligation to the City Assemblies did not signifie such a Confinement of Favor to particular Nations or Countries because this same Obligation

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 265

gation was supposed *common* to all *Cities* Chap. 9.
of all *Countries* and *Nations*. Nor
were they obliged to any greater dili-
gence for communicating with those
City-Assemblies for *Religion*, than they
were to the like *Secular Assemblies* for
their *Worldly Concernments*. All that lived
within the *Precincts* and *Jurisdications*,
how populous soever, were obliged to a
dependence on the *City-Assemblies* for
their *secular Government*; and they are
no more than *these* that, by our *Princi-*
ples, are obliged to *depend* on the same
Ecclesiastical Assemblies for their *Ecclesi-*
astical Government. And if it was thought
necessary that the *same multitude* should
by all Arts be endeared and linked toge-
ther in *one Body* for the better manage-
ment of their *Secular Interests*: it is no
way likely that the *Primitive Christians*
would break them into *several Bodies*
mutually *independent* on each other, or
on any third acknowledged Superior.
It is very well known how famous they
were for their *Love*, and how particu-
larly remarked by their *Heathen Adver-*
saries themselves. And it is also well
known how eagerly they took up and
continued any *Customs* that had been in-
troduced by the *Heathens*, of that kind,
for

Tertull. A-
pol.

Chap. 9. for the more endearing promotion of *Love and Unity*. Such were their *Heteria*, their *Fus Hospitii*, their *Love-Feasts* and *Kisses of Love*. And therefore, tho the *Legal Precedent* had left them *free*; yet they would not have thought *themselves* at liberty to neglect this way of binding *Citizens* together, on account of the very *Law of Charity*. They would rather be for introducing *new* Endearments and Dependencies, than for dissolving any of those which they had found *before*. Nor was this Communication of the *Publick Assemblies* so unpracticable in the most *Populous Cities* as our Brethren would make it *now*. Had *Preaching* been the whole Work of those *Assemblies*, then indeed no more could partake in them than could make up an *Auditory*. But when I derive their Obligation to the *Publick Assemblies* from their Obligation to partake in the *Publick Sacrifices*; what difficulty can there be to conceive how the same numbers that communicated in their *Popular Heathen Sacrifices* might not as easily communicate in the *Mystical Sacrifices* of *Christians*? How much easier was it to distribute so *small* Proportions of *Bread and Wine* as came to
the

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 267

the share of each, than such vast proportions of *Flesh* and *Wine* as were requisite to feast so great a multitude as usually assembled at their *Panegyres*? Chap. 9.
And yet it was not necessary that they should receive their Proportions exactly from the *same Land*, or in the *same place*. Whosoever received it within the *same Jurisdiction*, or from any person employed by the *Presidents* of those *Assemblies* was thereby judged to communicate with the *Presidents* themselves. That must have been the Case of them who carried the Sacrificed *Flesh home*, or sold it in the *Shambles*, and of them who obtruded it on the *Christians* before the *Secular Judicatories*. And therefore, by this way of *Interpretation*, all that communicated in the *Eucharistical Bread* which was carried home (as that was allowed in those times) all that communicated in that which was sent to the *Absents*, and all that communicated with any of the *Bishops Presbyters* in any other place within his *Jurisdiction* appointed by the *Bishop*, were, in the *Interpretation* of these common Laws and Usages concerning *Sacrifices*, judged to communicate with the *Bishop*. And then what difficulty was there then more than now why whole *Cities*

Chap. 9. *ties might not communicate with the Bishops?*

Señ. 13. AND this I also infer from the great *Anniversary Feasts* derived by the most *ancient Christians* from the *Jews*. That the *Feasts* of the *Pasover* and the *Pentecost* were so derived, every one knows who is any thing acquainted with *Antiquity*. And that the *Feast of Tabernacles* was so also is very probable from that very ancient custom of their bringing their *First Fruits* and *Offerings* to be blessed by the *Bishop*. For if they still thought the *Legal Precept* concerning those *Festivals* obligatory as to this particular Instance of *consecrating* the *Fruits* of their *Labors*; the *Reason* will as well hold for the *consecrating* the *second Harvest* in the *seventh Month*, or the *end* of the *Year* according to the *Rustick Kalendar*, or the old *Account* before their coming out of *Egypt*, as for the *first ripe Fruits* in *Easter*, or the *first ripe Harvest* in *Pentecost*. And it is certain that the *Fest* of the *seventh Month* was observed among the *Christians* of the fifth Century, tho it is hard to say that it was then *first* taken up by them. The *Jewish Original* would make one think it rather more *ancient*. The very celebrating these

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 269

these *Feasts* with their *Mystical Sacri-* Chap. 9.

fices in *other Cities* signified the equalling them with *Ferusalem* in this very same particular which had before been the *Prerogative* of *Ferusalem*. It signified their accounting the *City Bishops* answerable to the *Jewish High Priests*, because these *Festivals*, could not, among the *Jews*, be solemnized any where but in the *Seat* of their *High Priest*. And certainly the *design* of observing these *Festivals* in *Cities*, must have been not for *private*, but *publick Assemblies*. By the *Rule of Proportion*, all the whole *Cities* must have been, in *Reason*, as much concerned in *these*, as the whole *Nation* of the *Jews* were in the *same Festivals* as they were celebrated at *Ferusalem*. The very *introducing* therefore of these into *other Cities* implied their intending to *unite* these *Cities* into intire *Bodies* as they had before *united* the *Jewish Nation*. And considering how very early that *Paschal Controversie* was, and how much *higher* the *Practice* was derived on both sides, both in the *Eastern* and *Western* Parts of the *Roman Empire*; considering withal how very *early* those *Imitations* of the *Jews* must have been, for that very *Reason* because they were *imitations*

Chap. 9. *tations* of them, whom *Christians* were less disposed to imitate after the destruction of their *Temple*, and the *Dispersion* of their *Nation*, and the *National Animosities* which from that time forward alienated both sides from each other, when the *Jews* besides their unwearied *Persecutions*, cursed the *Christians* in their *Synagogues*, as they did in the time of *Typhon*, and the Temptations to yield in hopes of a Restitution of the *Jews* to their former *Greatness* were utterly taken away by the *Subversion* of the *Jewish Nation*; and considering withal how very probably they might be continued in consequence of the Reasoning I am speaking of, that nothing was to be laid aside of the *Jewish Establishments*, but what had been foretold to be of a *Temporary Nature*, and unsuitable to the State of *Mystical Judaism* under the *Gospel*, nor any thing any further than it was so *unsuitable*: I say, these things being considered, it will be very probable that these things were rather continued from the days of the *Apostles* to their times, than introduced afterwards. And if so, then it must by the same Reasoning appear, that this uniting the whole *Cities* in the same common Solemnities

Just. Mart.
Dial. cum
Typhone.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 273

Solemnities was likewise deduced from *Chap. 9.*
the same times of the *Apostles*.

C H A P. X.

*The City Jurisdictions were Answerable
to the Jurisdiction of the High Priest.*

The CONTENTS.

*Tho Christians of the same City had been
left to their Liberty whether they would
unite, or not, yet, supposing them
united, Subjects must have been oblig-
ed to their actual Terms of Union.*
Sect. I. 1. *In that Case, it must have
been indifferent, and therefore Lawful,
for them to unite so.* Sect. II. 2. *This
way of Union being once agreed on,
tho the Agreement had been only Hu-
man, yet the Obligation to Sub-
jects and Posterity would have been
Divine.* Sect. III. 3. *Tho the par-
ticular Instance had not, yet the Power
by which even that Instance had been
determined, had been from God.* Sect. IV.
4. *The*

Ch. 10.

4. *The Determination of the Limits of Jurisdiction was a thing absolutely necessary for preserving Unanimity among themselves in propagating their common Christianity.* Sect. V. 5. *The most equal way of determining these Limits, among Equals, is that of Occupation.* Sect. VI, VII. *This way of determining them will not oblige us to a Recourse to express Scripture.* Sect. VIII. *All Church-Members were obliged, by the ancient Canons, to a Personal Attendance at the Bishops Altar at some solemn Times.* Sect. IX. *The Ground of that Custom in the Jewish Precedent.* Sect. X.

Sect. I.

BUT tho this had been otherwise, and the Christians of the same City had been left to their Liberty, whether they would unite under any common Government or not, as to any general Establishment which God had made concerning it; yet where a Model was laid, and a Church was already begun, it could not be without breach of Unity that any could resist it, or revolt from it, and therefore were for the future obliged to submit to it. Now that this was actually

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 273

actually the Case that *all the Christians* of Ch. 10^o the *Cities* did *unite* themselves into a *Body*, is not only clear from the *Practice* of *those times* wherein our Adversaries themselves, who are skilled in *Antiquity*, acknowledge *Episcopacy* to have obtained, as in the time of *S. Cyprian*, but also of the *times* of the *Apostles* themselves. I mention nothing more to prove it at present but what has elsewhere been mentioned, the *Convertibleness* of *Churches* and *Cities* in the *Apostles times*. This therefore being supposed to have been their *actual* Case, whether they were *obliged* to it or *not*; I say, their *Successors* could not *infringe* this *Unity* so agreed on without the *Sin* of *SCHISM*. I mean such *Successors* as should attempt it *without* the *consent* of their *Ecclesiastical Governors* for the *time being*. Such were *they* against whom *S. Cyprian* reasoned, which is the Case for which I am concerned at *present*.

FOR 1. If no *Divine Right* did ob- Sect. 2^d
lige them to *unite* into *one Body*, it is
withal as certain that no *Divine Constitution* made it *unlawful* for them to do
so. And in that Case *it must have been*
indifferent, and therefore in their *own*
Power to settle what *extent* of their *Union*
T themselves

Ch. 10. themselves pleased, which when it was settled might for the future *oblige*, not only *themselves*, but their *Posterity*, at least such a *Posterity* of their *Subjects* as I am speaking of. This they might have done by that *Right* of *Human Power* which is inseparable from all *multitudes* that are *sui juris*, and which must particularly be acknowledged *Lawful* in *Cases undetermined* either way by any *Divine Interposition*. Every *single person* is acknowledged to have a *Power* to bind *himself* and his *Heirs*, which therefore cannot be denied to *Multitudes*. I shall not now digress so far as to debate the *Reasonableness* and *Equity* of it, because it is indeed a *Subject* more proper for another place. I shall now suppose it as a *Principle Fundamental* to all *Societies*. This is the only common *Principle* of *Equity*, not the *less*, but the *more obliging* because *not written*, as the *Laws* of *Nature* and *Nations* are much *more obliging* than any *Positive Local Statutes*, on which the *Perpetuity* of *Societies* once established does subsist, by virtue of which the *Legislative Power* and the *particular Laws* made by them, do not extinguish with the *Legislators Persons*; by virtue of which all *Leagues* and

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 275

and *Covenants* made by *Predecessors* are *Ch. 10.*
still reckoned as obliging to *Posterity*;
without any *new Ratification*; by virtue
of which the particular consent of every
new born *Child*, and every *Stranger*
is not thought necessary even in those
Governments, which did, at first, confessedly
arise from the *consent* of the *People*. And being
Principles of *Equity* grounded on the *common Right* of
Societies in general, they cannot be denied to
Ecclesiastical Societies more than others,
tho they also had been at first confederated
by the particular *Suffrages* of the
Laitie as well as the *Clergy*. And

2. THIS being once agreed upon, *Sect. 3.*
tho the agreement it self had been only
human, and the *Obligation* to *Posterity*
human too; yet the *Obligation* is *Divine*.
The *Sin* of *Theft* is not the less against a
Divine Law because the determination
of *Property* depends on *Human Constitutions*,
and is accordingly different in several places.
So that as that is *Property* in one place,
which is not so by the *Laws* of another,
it accordingly falls out that what is
Justice in that place where it is a
Property is *Theft* in that place where
the *Property* belongs to another.
Accordingly tho the determination of
T 2 the

Ch. 10. the extent of the Union of that Society which we call a Church had been derived only from the agreement of those who at first planted Christianity in a plate, yet the Obligation to preserve the Unity, when once established, may be Divine. None doubts but Parents are as fallible in requiring instances of Obedience from their Children as the Church is. Yet who doubts also but the Sin of Disobedience (in a matter of its own nature undetermined by the Law of God) is a breach of a Divine Law, tho the Parents were mistaken in the Prudence of the thing required by them as an instance of Obedience; and so that it be not unlawful? Yet such Mistakes plainly shew that the determining the instance of Obedience is from an Authority only Human and Fallible, nay actually mistaken. But whilst the determination extends no farther than their just Parental Power, to things not unlawful, however imprudent, that does not hinder but that the complex Act of Obedience, even in that particular human Instance, is obligatory by the Law of God. Accordingly, supposing the Obligation to external Ecclesiastical Unity to be Divine, and to have been indeed the principal Design of the Positive Establishments

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 277

blissments of God under the Gospel; it Ch. 10.
will also follow, that the *Obligation* to that same *Unity* in the *extent* to which the *Human Ecclesiastical Authority* had determined it, must also be *Divine*, supposing that the *Human Ecclesiastical Authority* had proceeded no further than what was *lawful* for a *Human Authority*. Which Reasoning will the rather hold if we consider

3. THAT indeed, tho the particular *Instance* be not expressly determined by God, yet the *Power*, by which even that *Instance* had been determined, had been from God. For it was God only that could make them *sui Furis*, and give them the *Power* of disposing of themselves, and settling *Rules* for obliging *themselves* and their *Posterity*, if the *Power* had been derived from the consent of the particular *Suffrages*. But much more it was so, supposing, on our Principles, that the *Power* of the Church, results from the *Power* of Sealing *Covenants* in God's name, and of intitling Persons to the *Privileged Society*, and to the *Privileges* of that *Society*. These were Powers that could come from none but God, and consequently all the *Authority* resulting from them, must be

Sect. 4.

Ch. 10. given together with *them*. And therefore, let our Adversaries state the ground of this determining the *Extent* of the *Unity* of *Christian Churches* as they please; yet they cannot state it so as to make the *Power* of determining the *extent* of it *purely Human*. If they call that *Power* *purely Human* which is seated in *Persons* pretending to no more than a *human Nature*, so the *Authority* of the *Apostles* themselves was *purely Human*, which notwithstanding themselves will not deny to have been also *Divine*, so that all *Affronts* and *Disobediences* to it were resented by *God* as committed against *Him* rather than the *Persons* of the *Apostles*. So were also *Moses* and *Aaron* *purely Men*, and yet the *Murmurings* of the *Children of Israel* are said to have been rather against *God* than *them*. So was also the *utinis an-
deotivm* to which the *Apostle* requires the *Christians* of those *times* to pay obedience, telling them that *They who resisted them resisted the Ordinance of God*.

Roman. XIII. 1, 2. If by *Human Determination* be meant the *Determination* of *Purely Human Prudence*, excluding all pretences to any extraordinary *Assistances* of *Divine Revelation*; then such are the fore-mentioned instances

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 279

instances of particular Acts of *Disobedi-* Ch. 10.
ence required by *natural Parents*, which
yet hinders not but that the *concrete Act*
of *Disobedience* redounds to *God*, who,
supposing the *Parents* no otherwise *assisted*,
has notwithstanding *obliged* *Children* to
Duty to them. If therefore by a *purely*
Human Power be understood a *Power*
wholly due to *purely human Combinations*,
or to which *God* has not *expressly* requir-
ed *Submission*; then it is plain that this
Power of the *Church* is not *purely Human*.
The *Power* is, as I said, derived from
God, and *God* has *expressly* required our
Duty to them who are *over us in the Lord*,
and who must *give an account* for our
Souls. And yet this is the only sense
they can mean, who make the *Determi-*
nation in such Cases, so *purely human* as
that *Men* may plead *Divine Authority*
against it, as if the *Divine Authority*
were no way concerned in the *Disobedi-*
ence. Otherwise none thinks it an al-
lowable pretence for *Disobedience* to an
inferior Governor, because the *particulars*
required are not *immediately* determined
by the *Prince* himself. None thinks it
a sufficient Plea in such a Case to pre-
tend that it is not the *Prince*, but the *in-*
ferior Governor, that requires such a

Ch. 10. *particular Instance of Obedience; and that therefore the Disobedience, in such a Case, is not to the Prince, but him; and that Prosecutions from him would be but causeless Persecutions of the Princes Loyal Subjects. The Sentiments of disinterested Mankind in such a Case are clearly otherwise. While the Authority is owned to be from the Prince; while it is foreseen that there will be Prudential Cases necessary to be determined which cannot, and ought not to be provided for by General Rules; whilst it is known that the Instance determined is no other than what is necessary for the Practicableness of the principal Ends of Government, and determined only by that Prudential Power which it is presumed the Prince intended to allow him when himself had not limited him by any Positive Prescriptions of his own; none doubts but Rebellion against such a Determination of an inferior Governor is a Rebellion against the Prince himself, and all Legal Judicatories appointed for such Matters, judge it so. And therefore supposing the first Determinations of this Extent of Churches had been only by the Prudence of the first Ecclesiastical Governors; yet that will not hinder but that*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 281

that the *Obligation* might have been *Ch. 10.*
Divine. Which will be the rather cre-
dible, if we consider

4. **T H A T** this *Determination of Sect. 5.*
the Limits of Jurisdiction, was indeed a
thing absolutely necessary for preserving
Unanimity among themselves in propaga-
ting their common Christianity. For if it
might have been in the Liberty of suc-
ceeding *Itinerants* to draw Persons, not
only from *Paganism* but from the
Churches already planted, whether on
account of *personal Emulations*, or par-
ticular *Covenants* of Persons profelyted
by them, what *confusion* would this
have introduced among them! How
would it have *exposed* them to the com-
mon Enemies of their Profession? How
would it have *scandalized* and *hardened*
them against all Conviction? What
Bitternesses and *Emulations* would it
have caused among *themselves*? What
Divisions into considerable *Fractions*?
What *Slanders* and *Reproaches* and mu-
tual *Recriminations*? What *Weakenings*
of the common *Interest* by the inconfi-
derableness of the single Parties? These
are the natural Fruits our *Independent*
Brethren constantly meet with when-
ever they *practise* consequently to their
Principles.

Ch. 10. *Principles.* The *Persons*, I doubt not, have many of them meant well. But whoever will observe the *success* of their *well-meant* Endeavours, will find them more successful at *destroying* than *planting*, at *dividing Christians* than *Professing* new *Disciples* to that Sacred Name. And if any among them have bestowed pains that way, yet they have had little assistance from their Brethren, which is not so much imputable to the want of *Zeal* in the *Persons*, as to their want of *Unanimity* and *Correspondence* for acting in a *common Body*, which has utterly been *destroyed* among them by those destructive *Principles* by which themselves had shaken off the *Yolk* of their *own Superiors*. Undoubtedly had the *Apostles* labored under the same *Difficulties*, they could never have made that progress in converting the *World* to *Christianity*, as we see they did. It was therefore absolutely necessary that every one should know his *Bounds*, and that when they were once settled, all others might be obliged to observe them too, that (as the *Apostles* expression is) none might invade *another's Line*. And therefore if there had been no *general Rule* agreed upon for it by *Christ* or his *Apostles*,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 283

Apostles, it must have been permitted *Ch. 10.* to the *Prudence* of the first *Church-Converters*. And because their *Authority* in this particular matter was so *fundamental* to the *success* of all their other generous undertakings; therefore it was necessary that this very *particular* of their *Power* should have been from *God* that so it might lay an *Obligation* on all others to observe it, who had otherwise been their *Equals*.

AND 5. *The most equal and acknowledged Right, and that which is sufficient in the Case for which I am concerned, is that of Occupation.* This is confessed to make a *Right* and *Property* in Cases wherein otherwise, before the Case of *Occupation*, others had *equal Right* with the *Occupant*. Even in the Case of the *State of Nature* wherein all men had *equal Right* to every thing, and wherein no *Property* had been distinguished by *Positive Laws*, yet *Occupation* is granted to make a *Property*. And in things which are yet left *common*, *Occupation* does *appropriate*. The *Water* in the *Fountain* is *common* for any, yet when any has taken a proportion for *himself*, none has right to that which he has taken but *He*. And this is also granted to hold

Ch. 10. hold true in *Jurisdctions*, as well as in *Possessions*. All have an *equal Right* to *uninhabited Countries*. Yet when any one has taken *Possession*, then none has any *Right* to them but *He*. So tho, in the *propagation* of the *Christian Religion*, none had more *Right* than *others* to challenge any particular *Precinct* for his own *Jurisdiction*; yet when a *Government* had once been set up in a *particular place*, and a *Precinct* designed for the *Jurisdiction*, none can then pretend any *Right* to the *People* to be converted within that *Precinct* but the *Government* so established. And this *Right of Occupation* does so *appropriate* as that all endeavours to *deprive* of the *Right* so *appropriated* are *injurious*, tho from persons who had *otherwise* as *much Right* to it as the *Occupant*. When a *Prince* has once seized and *possessed* an *uninhabited Country*, no *other Prince* has thence-forward any *Right* to it, and the *War* would be *unjust* on that *Princes* side who should endeavour to *deprive* him of it. And therefore by the same Reason, supposing the *Church* to have *settled* a *Jurisdiction*. Whoever else should *invade* the *Jurisdiction* so *appropriated*, must act *unjustly* in meddling with that to which he has

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 285

no *Right* after the *Jurisdiction* is once *Ch. 10.* appropriated by *Occupation*, so that the *Sin* must lie at the doors of such an *Invader*. And this *Title* by *Occupation* does then especially hold when no more is challenged than what is *really* occupied, that is, when the *Means* of Management are *suitable* to the *Charge* that is undertaken.

SHOULD the King of Spain, *Self. 7.* on the Discovery of the Continent of *America*, have laid claim to that whole, and as yet undiscovered Continent, that had been more than could be occupied by him and his *European* Dominions, and the same Case it would be in the *State* of *Nature*, if any single Person from his Title to particular *Dishes* of *Water*, should challenge the whole *Fountain*: That would be more than himself could use, and therefore could not deprive them of their *common* Right upon any pretence of *Occupation*. So it had been, in the Case of propagating *Christianity*, if a single Person had challenged a District too great for him and his *Assistants* to manage. But so it was not in the Case of *Diocesan Jurisdiction*. A *Bishop* and his *Clergy*, whom he might multiply as occasion required it, have oftentimes

Ch. 10. oftentimes attempted and succeeded in the *Conversion* and *Government* of a *Jurisdiction* larger than any of our present *Diocesses*. And therefore in this claim they challenge no more than what is in their Power really to occupy. And it still adds to the *Equity* of the *Title* by *Occupation*, if no more be challenged by it than what is usually challenged by the *generality* of equally dealing *Occupants*. What is challenged so, as it cannot be thought *partial*, when it has the approbation of so many reputed *impartial Dealers*; so it is for the *common Interest* of the whole multitude that the *Justice* of so many *Titles* be owned as unquestionable. And tho *private Interest* be indeed a corrupt *Rule* of *Judging*, yet *common interest* is that *Utile*, which as the *Stoicks* say, is so inseparable from *Honestum*, that we may thence conclude any thing to be indeed *Honest*, if it be in this sense *profitable*, and is indeed the *Principle* on which all *Reasonings* of this kind are grounded. In deducing the *Unwritten Laws* of *Nature* or of *Nations*, that is judged *Lawful*, which is for the *Interest* of *Mankind*, or of *Nations*. And therefore the *Bishop's Title* to a *Diocess*, that is, a *City* with its *District*, was therefore

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 287

therefore *just*, because it was agreeable *Ch. 10.* to the *general practice* of that *Age*. His Brethren generally as they challenged *Jurisdications*, so they had no other *Title* to their *Jurisdications* but this of *Occupation*, nor *narrower Limits* of their *Jurisdications* than those of a *Dioceſs* so explained; and therefore were in *common interest* concerned to own this Plea for *him* as they would expect that *he* and all *others* should *ratifie* their *own*. This is perfectly agreeable with our *Saviour's* own Rule of *Justice* of dealing with *others* as they design'd to be *dealt* with *themselves*.

THIS *Title* of *Occupation* is the more *Sect. 8.* proper to be insisted on in this matter, because as it is the usual way of *deciding Titles* in Case of *equal Right*, and where there are no *written Laws* to determine them; so it will not oblige any to a direct Recourse to the *Scriptures*. For it is not *necessary*, nor *reasonable*, that we should expect that from *Scripture* which may *otherwise* be *known*, and known *certainly*, and known by the *vulgar* of them who are concerned in the *Practice* of it. As *God* does not work *Miracles*; but in Cases exceeding *Human Power*; so neither have we any reason to expect that
he

Ch. 10. he should make any *Miraculous Discoveries* but in Cases *exceeding the Discovery of Human Reason*. Now what necessity is there that our Adversaries can pretend why *God* should be *obliged to decide* such Controversies as *these* in the *Scriptures*? Is it the *moment* of the thing? But the *greatest* and most *Piacular Sins* that are, are those against the *Law of Nature*, which yet are supposed *known* and *acknowledged* antecedently to *Revelation*, and therefore do as much concern those who never knew of any *Supernatural Revelation* as those who have received it. If therefore these *greater Sins* which are indeed more *Criminal* than any which are committed against *express Revelation*, (and which accordingly do more concern the *Goodness* of the *Divine Providence* that his *Creatures* be sufficiently secured from them) do notwithstanding not require *Revelation* when they may be sufficiently known otherwise; there can, on this account, be no need that the now described Principles of *natural Equity* should be particularly accounted for in the *Scripture*. Do they therefore expect them there because, tho they might indeed be known *sufficiently*, yet they could not be known
so

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 289

so *certainly* without exprefs *Revelation*? Ch. 10.
But neither will this *oblige* God to reveal what may otherwise be known *sufficiently* without *Revelation* (he satisfies the *Obligations* of his natural *Goodness* in providing means *sufficient*, tho it were possible that other means might be thought of which would be more *certain*.) nor is it indeed true that Truths of this nature could receive any *Additional Certainty* by being *revealed*. *Revelation* it self, as it must be made appear to *Us* (and it can no otherwise *oblige Us* than as it can be made so to appear) must be resolved into some Propositions neither more *certain*, nor more *evident*, than those are, and therefore can add nothing to them unless it be possible to conceive that *Conclusions* may be more *certain* or *evident* than their *Premises*. Besides that *Revelations* themselves, when found contrary to such *natural Evidence*, are either disowned for *Genuine*, or, (which turns to the same account) disowned at least in the *Literal Sense*, and expounded *mystically*. Why should this be if *evidence* of this kind were not, on all hands, owned for *greater* than can be expected for any *positive Revelation*? If they pretend any
V particular

Ch. 10. particular *design* God had to inform us of things of this nature in the Scriptures, let them produce their *evidence* of any such *design*. But that is a task which, I believe, themselves will be willing to be excused from.

Señ. 9. THUS, according to the Notions received in those times, the *Bishops* answered the *High Priests* in this very particular, That all within his *Jurisdiction*, that is, all who, upon other occasions, did ordinarily meet in *General Assemblies*, were thought obliged to a dependence on those Assemblies in which the *Bishop* did preside, as the whole *Nation* of the *Jews*, where-ever dispersed, were to those of *Jerusalem* as the fixed residence of the *High Priest*. This was ordinarily shewn in receiving from the hands of those who were appointed by him in any part of his *Jurisdiction*, as the whole City of *Jerusalem* was also *holy*, and *holy* in relation to this purpose of *Feasting* on their *Anniversary Sacrifices*, wherein I have shewn that our Saviour intended that other *Jurisdictions* should equal it under the Gospel. Yet there were withal some Customs continued in the Church in favor of a *personal Communion* with the *Bishop* as far as was possible

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 291

possible that so they might yet keep nearer to the Precedent of the *High Priest* to whom the *Jewish* Males were obliged to come from all parts for a *personal* participation in his Sacrifices. This appeared in the *Eulogia* sent from the *Mother Churches* to the Churches depending on them, especially in those *Canons* obliging some of each to a *personal* attendance on the *Bishops Altar*, as has already been observed by a Learned Friend, if those Customs were from the beginning, which cannot easily be disproved. In this they exactly answered this *Jewish Original*, that they were the chief publick *Anniversaries* that were particularly designed for them, which were the only *Times* wherein the *Jews* themselves were obliged to that attendance. If these Customs were not from the beginning, I am apt to think the reason was not because they were indifferent as to their deference to the *Bishops Altar*, but because the need of them was supplied in a way as convenient for communicating multitudes from the same *individual Altar*, that was by sending *Portions* to the *Absents*, for which we have the express Testimony of *S. Justin Martyr*, as I have else-

Answer to
Mr. Baxter's Chur:
Hist. ch. i.
p. 35.

Ch. 10. where observed. Even by the *Jewish* Precedent, their *Paschal Lambs*, tho they were to be sacrificed in the Temple, yet they were properly to be eaten in their *private Houses*, which therefore obliged them to no more attendance than to see them *sacrificed* and brought home. On this account, there seems, for a long while, to have been no need of *private Ministrations*, unless perhaps with the *sick*, or the *Martyrs* and *Confessors* in *Prison*, if we may believe some ancient Monuments of that kind. Yet I am withal apt to think that the ordinary way of *communicating* even such, was, at first, rather of *Species* already *consecrated*, than by a distinct and particular *Consecration*. So it was in the Case of *Serapion*. The *Presbyter* sent the *Bread* ready *consecrated* to him, only he ordered the Messenger by whom he sent it, to *moisten* it before he gave it, probably that the *Wine* which had been dried in it, when it was to be kept, according to the practice of the *πενήρια* still continued in the *Greek Church*, might be thus revived, that so both *Species* might be received, whereas the consecrated *Wine* it self was not so capable of preservation. If this were constant,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 293

constant, then the *Oblation* and *Conse-* Ch. 10.
cration were still performed at none but
the *Bishop's Altar*, which was sufficient
to make all *Communicants* with that *Indi-*
vidual Altar of the *Bishop* at what di-
stance soever they were when they so
received it.

NOT to repeat what I have else Sect. 10.
where said to prove it, this very way of
Reasoning from *Levitical Presidents*
might justly make them scrupulous in
this matter, when the *other Altars*, tho
subordinate to the *chief Altar*, were ra-
ther *connived* at, than *approved* of, un-
der the old Dispensation. Otherwise it
is not probable that they would so early
have found out such shifts for preserving
the Elements for the use of those who
desired to receive more frequently than
the ordinary returns of their *Synaxes*.
And this doth withal the more confirm
me in it that the *Deacons* were princi-
pally confined to the attendance on the
Bishop, and not so usually employed in
the service of the *Presbytery*. Hence it
is that they were called the *Oculi Epif-*
copi; that even in *great Cities* where the
Presbyters were very numerous, the
number of *Deacons* was very small, ge-
nerally not exceeding the number of se-

Ch. 10. ven, according to the Canon of *Neocaesarea*, a number small enough for this attendance on the *Bishop* alone, but very much too small and disproportionable for the Service of the *Presbytery*; that, accordingly in *Rome* they vyed with the *Presbyters* themselves, which they could have had no pretence for if their Office had obliged them ordinarily to any Service to the *Presbyters*. But in the ancient *Offices* of the *Church*, especially the *Eucharistical*, the *Deacons* bore a considerable part, which were therefore not fitted for the use of the *Presbyters* alone, which makes it probable that it was intended that *Presbyters* should use the Office of *Consecration* when they were not with the *Bishops*. And herein also they answered the *Levites*, in the Old Law, who had their *Offices* in the *Sacrifices* of the Temple so that they could not be performed without them. This Reasoning I take for very agreeable to the Notions of those Times.

CHAR.

C H A P. X I.

The Primitive Christians did, and, by the received Principles of those Times were obliged to own their Eucharist for a Mystical Sacrifice.

The CONTENTS.

The Sacrifices and High Priesthood of the Gospel are Mystical. Sect. I. Such a Sacrifice necessary under the Gospel as may answer the Publick Sacrifices under the Law. Sect. II. This Mystical Evangelical Sacrifice must be expected from some Positive Institution of the Gospel. Sect. III. Eucharistical Sacrifices most suitable to the State of the Gospel. Sect. IV. Hence probably the very name of Eucharist. Sect. V. Christ's Priesthood being the Priesthood of Melchizedech, his Sacrifice ought also to be the Sacrifice of Melchizedech, that of Bread. Sect. VI. Not only this Reasoning, but the Inference deduced from it, were granted and used by the Ancients, Sect. VII. Suppo-
V 4 *sing*

Ch. II.

posing the Notions of *those* Times, they must needs have taken the Eucharist for a Mystical Sacrifice. Sect. VIII. On account of it's being a Mystical Sacrifice it had, according to the Principles of *those* Ages, a juster Title to the Name of a Sacrifice. Sect. IX, X, XI. And to the Thing. Sect. XII. XIII.

Sect. I.

BUT that which more nearly concerns the design of this present way of Reasoning is that these *Sacrifices* and this *High Priesthood* of the Gospel were *Mystical*, and so *Mystical* as not only to signify, but also to perform, what was, according to the sense of those times, to be expected from *Mysteries*. Upon the proof of this depended the whole efficacy of these Principles, in reference to the *Mystical Unity*, which is indeed the only *Unity* that is *beneficial*, and consequently in reference to the *Sin* and *Mischief* of *SCHISM*, which can be no otherwise formidable than as it is a *dissolution* of this *Mystical Unity*. And this also they did believe, and had not reason to believe themselves mistaken in believing so, that the *Eucharist* was the *Mystical Sacrifice* performing the same

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 297

same thing under the *Gospel* as the *Ex-Ch. 11.*

ternal Bloody Sacrifices under the *Law*, and that their *Bishops* were the *Mystical High Priests* exactly answering them in that very particular *Office* of *uniting* with the *Δόγμα*; when these things are made appear, I know not what can be desired further to shew how prudently, and withal how solidly, they proceeded in this way of managing this Dispute.

SUPPOSING therefore, that *Señ. 2.* this was the way of stating the Controversie between the *Primitive Christians* and the *Jews*, that the *Christians* did not pretend to oppose the *Jewish* with a *new Religion*, but only to oppose the *Literal Judaism* with a *Mystical* one; the consequence of this would naturally be this, that as they did not *deny*, but *mysticize*, the *Religion*, so neither would they *deny*, but *mysticize* all those things which the *Jews* of those times insisted on, and gloryed in, as the greatest Privileges and Advantages of their Religion. I might give Examples in other matters if I were not unwilling to digress. But to confine my self more particularly to my present Subject, one of the things the *Literal Jews* boasted of as *Privileges* of their Profession was the *λατρεία*, *Rom.*

Ch. 11. IX. 4. meaning thereby the whole Service of the Temple, but especially that of *Sacrifice*. Accordingly the *Christians* challenged their λογικῷ λατρείᾳ, their *Mystical Service*. So I rather understand it than as it is commonly translated *Reasonable Service*. So λογικὸν γάλα is *Mystical Milk*, opposed to *Milk* in a *Literal Sense*. And that by λατρεία the Apostle himself understood the *Sacrifices*, appears from his application, when he makes the λογικὴ λατρεία to consist in presenting their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God. Rom. XII. 1. But this kind of *Sacrifice* was not sufficient to supersede the public bloody *Sacrifices*, for it was as obliging under the times of *Judaism*, when notwithstanding those public *Sacrifices* were thought and granted to have been obliging also. The *Sacrifice* therefore that must, in this way of Reasoning, at least equal the *Mystical* with the *Literal Judaism*, and withal disoblige the *Mystical Jew* from the use of those public *Sacrifices*, must be such as would perform all for which those public *Sacrifices* were intended, to as beneficial, tho greater, purposes. And therefore the public *Sacrifices* being, as has been shewn, designed

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 299

signed as Ceremonies of *Admission* to a Ch. II.
League and Covenant, and intimate *Union*
with *God*; such a kind of *Sacrifice* was
requisite to be asserted to our *Mystical*
Israelitism, as might engage *God* in
Covenant with *Us*, and admit us to a
Mystical Union with him.

THIS therefore being granted, it Sect. 3.
was also further plain that this *Mystical*
Sacrifice was to be expected by *positive*
Prescription of *God* himself, and there-
fore must be found among the *positive*
Prescriptions of the *Gospel*. For no ex-
ternal *Rites* could either *oblige God*, or
unite the *Worshipers* to *him* by any *na-*
tural efficacy of the things themselves,
and therefore what *efficacy* soever they
were conceived to have must wholly be
derived from the *Divine Pleasure* and
Appointment, which it is withal impossi-
ble for us to *know* without *positive* and
expres *Revelation*. Whatever might
be said concerning the natural virtue of
these *Rites* for conciliating the good
will of the ordinary *Demons* who were
thought *corporeal*, and to have *Vehicles*
capable of being naturally affected by
Bodies suitable to their nature; yet
the *Supreme Being* was expressly exempted
from all such natural influences by that
very

Ch. 11. very same Philosophy which made the others *obnoxious* to such influences. So we are assured by *Synefius*, than whom none better understood the whole *Hypothesis* of that *Philosophy* which was generally received in the Primitive Times of *Christianity*. Οὐ γὰρ ὅτι τὰ χερσιανῶν, ὡς ἀπὸ ἀναγκῆς εἶναι ταῖς τελεστικαῖς ὑλαῖς τε καὶ φαντασίαις, ὥσπερ ὀλκαῖς πρὶν φυσικῶς ἀπολεθῆναι τὸ θεῖον, ὅπερ ἂν πᾶσι πνεύμα ἐγκόσμιον, ἀλλ' ὥστε παρεῖναι ταῖς ἀπαθείαις καὶ ταῖς οὐκείαις τῷ θεῷ διαδέσειν. Ep. 67. ad Theoph. For the *Mysteries* of the *Christians* are not so understood, as if the Deity were under any necessity of following the *Materials* or *Words* made use of in the *Mystical Rites* on account of any natural attractive Power in them, which may indeed be the Case of the *Mundane Spirit*; but so as that God is present at them from an inclination free from passion, and proper, and becoming a Deity. This *Synefius* had from the *Oracles*, especially the *Chaldee* ones collected first in Verse by *Julian* surnamed *Ῥεσσεύς*, a *Chaldee*, *Suid.* and after commented on by *Porphyry* in his περὶ τῆς ἐκ λόγων φιλοσοφίας. Passages to this purpose may be seen in the *Oracles* as extant at present, and in other Fragments of *Oracles*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 301

cles of *Porphyries* Collection mentioned *Ch. II.*
by *Euseb. Pr. Eu.* IV. 9. V. 8, alluded to
by *Synesius* himself *de Insomn.* and *Ni-*
seporus Gregoras upon him. And this
Notion of the Exemption of the Deity
from all influence of Corporeal Beings
is, at large, insisted on by *Iamblichus* in
his excellent Work *de Myster. Egypt.*
So that the *Supreme Being* (which was
that which both Parties, the *Literal* and
Mystical Jews, appropriated to them-
selves as the *Segullah*) was on all hands
owned free from all *Obligations* but
those of his own arbitray pleasure and
appointment, which cannot, as I said,
appear to us but by his express *Promise*
and *Revelation*. And yet even among
those *inferior Demons*, as no *Sacrifices*
were effectual but those which were
suitable, and accordingly each *Demon*
had his *peculiar Sacrifices*, and upon ex-
traordinary occasions of expiating the
displeasure of some *unknown Demon*;
some appointments yet more singular;
so the *knowledge* of the *Sacrifices* which
were *peculiar*, was reserved to the *De-*
mon himself, and it was thought *piacu-*
lar for any *mortal* to obtrude himself into
the *Secrets* of such a *Demon* without his
leave and his *discovery*, and they were
accordingly

Ch. 11. accordingly accounted *Divine Persons* who first acquainted mortals with Discoveries of this nature. So that if it were needful we might take the Proposition for universally granted in *those Ages*, That no *Sacrifices* could oblige the *Deity* without *Positive Revelation* either of their *natural influence*, or that it was his *actual pleasure* to be obliged by them. And therefore these *Mystical Sacrifices* can only be expected from the *Positive Institutions* of the *Gospel*.

Sect. 4. IF therefore we can only expect these *Mystical Evangelical Sacrifices* among the *positive Institutions* of the *Gospel*, the enquiry then cannot be difficult. There are but *two* Institutions of this kind pretended, and whether of these was more probably intended to supply the Office of *Sacrifices* will easily be known by the Analogy they bear to the *Sacrifices* then received. That which came nearest them was, in all likelihood intended by God himself to supply their use in this new Institution. And this will then be best known if we first remember what kind of *Sacrifices* were granted by the *Christians* to be really *useful*, and therefore of *eternal Obligation*, even under the state of *Mystical Israelitism*.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 303

Israelitism. It is certain they thought *Ch. 10.*
some *Sacrifices* designed by God himself
as *temporary*, and what they thought so,
they could not think themselves obliged
to *continue*. Now what they thought
so will best appear by these Reasonings
against the *Jews* on this very Subject
concerning *Sacrifices*. Therein they
shew, that it was *impossible that the blood*
of Bulls and Goats could be available for *Ebr. X. 4.*
the *expiation of Sin*, which Reasoning
does indeed proceed against *Expiatory*
Sacrifices, such of them especially as
were to be of the *Blood of Brutes*, and
needed *Repetition*, which the Apostle
makes an Argument of the *imperfection*,
not only of such *Sacrifices* themselves,
but of the *Dispensation* also which was
provided of no better *Sacrifices*, and for
that reason concludes them not agreeable
to the *Dignity* of the *Gospel*. But in
Eucharistical Sacrifices, no *Expiation* was
pretended to be made, but only a return
of acknowledgments for favors received,
and among them there was the *Liba*, the
Meat-Offering and the *Drink-Offering*,
which indeed seems to have been most
proper to such *Sacrifices*, almost exactly
answering our *Eucharist*. These are
the *Sacrifices* which are there approved
where

Ch. II. where the other Sacrifices are rejected, the *ἑνὸς αἰῶνος* in *Psal. L. 14.* In these no *Sins* were commemorated, and therefore they must needs have been thought most agreeable with a state of *perfect expiation*. These are common to a *perfect* as well as an *imperfect* condition, and therefore more likely to be of *eternal* use, and not *antiquated* with the temporary *shadows* of the *Law*. And, which comes more exactly home to my design, these were, according to the Customs of all Nations who admitted any *Sacrifices*, used on such occasions when *good News* were brought them, they did *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, and therefore extremely suitable to the very *Title* of the *Gospel* as an *εὐαγγέλιον*, the very word taken up by the *Christians* from the *Hellenistical* Version of the *Old Testament*, and thence derived by the *Apostle* himself in the *Epistle* to the *Romans*. Nay, according to the sense of the *Heathen Philosophers* themselves who undertook the defence of Religion against the *Epicureans* (and who very much influenced the *Hellenists*, as those did also the *Primitive Christians*) these were most agreeable to the *primitive* design of *Sacrifices*, I mean not only as they

Psal.
LXVII.
 12. *OR*
LXVIII.
 11. *ICXL.*
 9. *LII.2.*
Nah. I. 15.
Rom. X.
 15.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 305

they were *Eucharistical*, but as they Ch. II.
 were confined to the *Liba* without *Blood*,
 and were withal owned as most suitable
 to the Dignity of the *Supreme Deity*.
 So the *farre litabo* in *Persius*, the *thure*
pio & saliente micâ in *Horace*, the Oracle
 concerning *Hermioneus* in the Notes of
Hierocles on the *Golden Verses*. Both
 these things are not only granted, but
 also proved by one of the greatest Ene-
 mies of the *Christian Religion* in a just
 Discourse upon that Subject. And up-
 on this Supposition, it was very natural
 for the *Primitive Christians* to take it up,
 not only as they challenged to them-
 selves that Right of the *Segullah* only, of
 worshipping the *Supreme Deity*, but also as
 they insisted on that, among other parti-
 culars, in their *Reasonings* against the
 common imputation of Novelty, that
 they reduced all things to their first *Ori-*
ginals, and those Originals more ancient
 than the *Mosaick Law* which was urged
 against them. Thus our *Saviour* in the
 Case of *Divorces*. Thus *S. Paul* in that of
Abraham's Justification by Faith before he
 was *circumcised*, to name no more at
 present.

Porphyr. de
Abstin.

ACCORDINGLY I am very *Seet. 5.*
 apt to think that this is indeed the true

X

Original

Ch. 11. *Original of the name of Eucharist as applied by the Primitive Christians to this very Sacrament, that they intended thereby to signify that this was, among them, to perform the Office of a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving. The very name was thus commonly applied to the Bread it self in the time of S. Justin Martyr. So he tells us expressly : Καὶ ἡ τροφή αὐτὴ καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῶν δὲχαρις. And this is indeed a more natural account than that which is there alluded to by that blessed person, as if it were called so from the δὲχαρις, the Thanksgiving and Blessing that was used over it in the Office of Consecration. This giving of Thanks was no more than what was generally used by the Christians of those times in their common Meals, which yet were never therefore called Eucharists. Nor is it to be thought strange that the word thus used in the Abstract should be thus applied. The ordinary term used concerning the other sort of Sacrifices which were expiatory is to call them περὶ ἁμαρτίας, or ὑπὲρ, &c. Yet the very Abstract name of ἁμαρτία is also used concerning them. So the Priests are said to eat the Sins of the People : Hos. IV. 8. because they did indeed eat their*

Apol. II. P.
97.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 307

their shares of those *Sacrifices* which *Ch. 11.*
were offered for the *Sins* of the *People*.
This expression exactly answers our present Case.

THUS far the Christians might *Seet. 6.*
have been led into this substitution of
the *Eucharist* as the proper *Evangelical*
Sacrifice, even from the popular received
Notions of the *Hellenists* concerning *Sacrifices*.
But yet, in this Reasoning
from the Old Testament *Prefigurations*
even of *Evangelical Sacrifices*, they
might yet justify a further Change from
the common usages as designed by God
himself in that *Sacrifice* which he intended
should last for ever. Thus having
shewn that *Christ's Priesthood* was not
after the order of *Aaron*, but a new
Order, that of *Melchizedec*, to which
perpetuity was expressly appropriated by
the *Psalmist*; the same Reasoning
would then hold for an alteration in the
Sacrifice which is used expressly by the
Apostle himself to prove an alteration of
the *Covenant*. If there be any difference,
it would rather be here that the
Reasoning proceeds more strongly in
the former Case. For the Notion of
Sacrifice is more intrinsically involved in
the very Notion of a *Priest*, who has

Ch. 11. no other Relation to *A Covenant* than that of a *Mediator*, nor mediates any otherwise than as the *Covenant* it self was entred into by such *Sacrifices* wherein it was *his Office* to preside. As therefore his concernment in *Sacrifice* is fundamental to his concernment in the *Covenant*, so also the *change* of the *Covenant* must necessarily suppose a *change* in the *Sacrifice* as antecedent to it. And this would bring the Reasoning yet more close to the *Materials* of our *Christian Sacrifice* as consisting of the very Elements of *Bread* and *Wine*. For if our Saviour's *Priesthood* was to be of the Order of *Melchizedec*, then his *Sacrifice* must also be of the same kind as those of *Melchizedec*. And if we may again reason concerning the *Sacrifice* of *Melchizedec* from what is mentioned concerning it in the *Story*, as the Apostle concludes his being *without Father* or *Mother*, or *Genealogy*, or *beginning of Days*, or *end of Life*: because the *History* of *Genesis* mentions neither his *Father*, nor *Mother*, nor *Genealogy*, &c. Then for the same reason we may conclude that he had no other *Sacrifice* but that of *Bread* and *Wine* because no other is mentioned in that place. Which Inference

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 309

rence will the rather hold because of the *Ch. 11⁷*
Connexion of that *Action* with the men-
tion of his *Priesthood*. So it is in the
Text, *Melchizedec king of Salem brought*
forth bread and wine: and he was the priest *Gen. XIV.*
of the most high God. *18.* The *Vulgar* reads
it, *Erat enim*, with a *Causal Particle*.
And unless some such thing be under-
stood, it will not be easie to give any
tolerable account of the pertinency and
connexion of the former part of the
Verse with the later. For what *relation*
could his bringing forth *Bread and Wine*
have with his *Priesthood*, if not as the
proper *Sacrifice* which concerned him as
a *Priest*? Why should this *Mystical*
Priesthood be mentioned as a *Precedent*
of a *future Priesthood* (as it was sup-
posed to be by those who used this *Rea-*
soning) unless it were also known what
Sacrifice was to be proper to him, seeing
that, in the same Reasoning, it was also
granted that every *Priest* ought to have
something to offer? And what was so
proper for *Melchizedec* as a *Priest* as to
meet *Abraham* with congratulatory
Exultations, Sacrifices for his *Victory*, and
to entertain him and his *Army* with a
Feast upon those *Sacrifices*? And why
should *Abraham* return his thanks in a

Ch. II. way becoming him as a *Priest* by giving him the *Tithes* and *ἀνεσθία* of his *Spoils*, the usual way of expressing their thankfulness to their *Gods* for *Victories*, according to the customs of those times, and which the *Apostle* understands to have concerned him as a *Priest*, when he thence concludes the *preference* of the *Priesthood* of *Melchizedec* to that of *Levi* who *payed Tithes* to him in *Abraham*; unless himself had been first treated by him as a *Priest* in that entertainment of him? Whatever may be thought of the *Reasoning* it self as abstracting from *Inspiration*; yet certainly considering the *Opinions* and *Circumstances* of that *Age*, there can be little reason to doubt but that this would have been the *actual Reasoning* of persons so *circumstantiated*, and so *perswaded*. And then considering them as persons for whom *Providence* was so peculiarly concerned as not to leave them to their own Reasonings in matters of great consequence, but only in such cases where their *Reasonings*, how *fallible* soever in themselves, were yet *secure* from *actual error*; it plainly follows that if they were left to them here, they must here also be *secure* from *actual error*. But then

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 311

then especially this Argument will hold *Ch. 11.*
when the whole Reasoning is grounded
on such *Principles*, as are otherwise al-
lowed and supposed by such persons,
whom all grant to have been assisted, in
those very Discourses wherein they are
supposed, by a *Supernatural* and *Divine*
Inspiration.

IT hence appears how naturally this *Sect. 7.*
Reasoning, so agreeable to the *Principles*
then granted by the *Christians*, does pro-
ceed on this Supposition, that the *Eu-*
charist was their *Mystical Sacrifice*. I
might now proceed to shew that not on-
ly the *Reasoning*, but the *Conclusion* it
self, was also owned by them, that they
did own the *continuance* of *Sacrifices* un-
der the times of *Christianity*, and parti-
cularly that they took the *Eucharist* for
the *Sacrifice* proper to those *times*, if this
had not been a *common* place usually de-
bated between *Us* and the *Romanists*,
where our *Writers* and our *Church* too,
do usually grant as much as I am con-
cerned for, that it is indeed an *Euchari-*
stical Sacrifice, and that this is the true
sense of those passages of Antiquity
which are produced for this purpose.
And I have shewn that their Principles
of *Reasoning* were against the *repetition*

Ch. II. of *Propitiatory Sacrifices*, which is that which is denied by our Writers. I am unwilling to enlarge on things already commonly observed, especially when what I am concerned for is already granted me on all hands, as it is here. I only observe now that this particular Reasoning is the Reasoning of S. Cyprian: *Item in Sacerdote Melchizedec Sacrificii Dominici Sacramentum præsfiguratum videmus, secundum quod Scriptura Divina testatur & dicit; & Melchizedec Rex Salem protulit panem & vinum. Fuit autem Sacerdos Dei summi, & benedixit Abraham. Quod autem Melchizedec typum Christi portaret, declarat in Psalmis Sp. S. ex personâ Patris ad Filium, dicens; Ante Luciferum genui te: tu es Sacerdos in æternum secundum ordinem Melchizedec. Qui ordo utique hic est de Sacrificio illo veniens & inde descendens, quod Melchizedec Sacerdos Dei summi fuit, quod panem & vinum obtulit, quod Abraham benedixit. Nam quis magis Sacerdos Dei summi quàm Dominus noster Iesus Christus? qui sacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem quod Melchizedec obtulerat, id est, panem & vinum, suum scilicet corpus & sanguinem. Ep. LXIII. Panncl. I mention this the more particularly*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 313

particularly, because S. Cyprian is our principal Author in the whole Argument *Ch. II.*

from *One Priesthood* and *One Altar*, that the Reader may see how accurately, what is said concerning it, is agreeable to his mind. Now these things being put together, That this whole Reasoning, both *Premises* and *Conclusion* too, were owned by them, and that they were withal taken up from such *Originals* as could not fail them, it plainly follows that the whole Reasoning was solid as urged against the *Ancient SCHISMATICKS*, at least as to this Particular, That the *Eucharist* is a *Mystical Sacrifice*.

BUT that I may as little urge them *Sect. 8.* with *Authorities* as is possible, who, I know, have little reverence for any Authority that is purely *Human*, let me intreat our Adversaries to remember, how the *Hellenists* themselves conceived the *Sacrifices* available for procuring the *Benefits* expected by them, and then let themselves judge whether the *Eucharist* may not reasonably be allowed to perform the Office of a *Mystical Sacrifice*. In the Reasonings of the *Hellenists* the Archetypal High Priest was the Δόγμ, the *Adytum* was Heaven, the *Sacrifice* that

Ch. II. that which was there *spiritually* offered to the *Father*. This *Sacrifice* was indeed acknowledged alone for the *true Sacrifice* as the *Platonists* used the term of *Truth* only concerning the *Archetypals*, and the *external Sacrifices* themselves were no further thought to deserve the name of *Sacrifices* than as they represented and transacted and applied the *Benefits* of that *invisible Sacrifice*. Which being supposed, it will plainly follow that, if the *Christian Eucharist* do perform the same Office of *representing*, and *transacting*, and *applying* that *invisible Sacrifice*, this will have as just a claim to the name of a *Sacrifice* as those *visible Slaughters* of *Beasts* had. Now to bring this home to the *Eucharist*, what is there that could be doubted of by any who lived in those times? that can be doubted of even by our *Brethren* themselves? Is it that *Christ* is the *Λόγος* who was supposed by the *High Priest* who offered the *invisible Sacrifice*? Is it that his *invisible Sacrifice* is most efficaciously represented and applied by his *external Oblation* of himself upon the *Cross*, so that even those *External Legal Sacrifices* could no otherwise represent and apply the *Virtue*

of

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 315

of this *invisible Sacrifice* than as they primarily represented this bloody *Evangelical Sacrifice* on the *Cross*, and therefore hence derived immediately their very Title to the *Name of Sacrifices*? Is it that this Blessed *Sacrament* was designed purposely for this end, to represent that *Sacrifice* of our Blessed Lord upon the *Cross*, and more immediately so designed than those *Legal Sacrifices* themselves? I suppose our Adversaries themselves will not doubt but that the *Eucharist* was designed, at least, to represent this *Prototypical Sacrifice* upon the *Cross*. But can they indeed think that *Representation* was all, and that *Application* was not designed also? Was there no *Application* in those *Representations* under the *Law*? Wherein then consisted the material *Benefit* of those *Representations*? Was this indeed the glorious *Privilege* of the *Segullah* to have great things only represented to them? Or are the *Evangelical Representations* less efficacious than the *Legal*? What some of our dividing Adversaries may deny I know not; But I cannot foresee any thing in this Reasoning that would be doubtful either by the *Reasonings* of the *New Testament*, or the *Sentiments* of the most *Ancient Times* of *Christianity*.

THUS

Ch. II. THUS they must unavoidably
 Sect. 9. have been obliged to acknowledge the
Eucharist for, at least, a *Mystical Sacrifice*. Nor let any one think it a *diminishing* expression to call it *Mystical*. Whatever People may think of it who judge of *ancient* things and opinions by *present* Notions and significations of Terms much changed from their ancient *Design*: yet whoever would judge truly concerning them, what either the *Ancients* would have *thought* reasonable, or what *himself* would have *thought* so if he had lived in the advantageous *Circumstances* of the *Ancients* for deriving things from their first and purest Originals, must reason from the Notions of Terms as *then* understood if he would infer Consequences agreeably to *their minds* that used them, or know what was really solid reasoning then. And if we consider the *Notion* of a *Mystical Sacrifice* as understood *then*, it will be far from diminishing either the *propriety* of the *signification*, or the *efficacy* of the *thing*. As to the *propriety* of the *signification*, it has appeared that the prime *signification* of Terms was, according to the *Platonists* (from whom these Notions were first derived, tho afterwards further confirmed

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 317

confirmed by *Revelation*) principally *Ch. 11.*
 applied to the *Archetypal Incorporeal*
Beings, which are therefore called
ἀόρατα and *ὄντως ὄντα*, so that all *Corpo-*
real Beings have the same name com-
 municated to them only by *extrinsecal*
Denomination (to use the Language of
 the *Modern Schools*) from them, as not
 truly worthy of the name any further
 than as they were *related* to them. This
 very Language is imitated by the *Sacred*
Writers themselves. Thus the *true Ta-*
bernacle is the *Incorporeal Ideal Taberna-*
cle, which the *Lord pitched and not man.*
Heb. VIII. 2. The *true Riches* are the
invisible enjoyments of Heaven. S. Luk.
XVI. 11. *Christ* is the *true Light*, not
 the *sensible* but the *intellectual Light*,
 which *inlighteneth every man that cometh*
into the world. S. Fohn I. 9. His *Flesh* is
 meat indeed, and his *Blood* is drink in-
 deed. *S. Fohn VI. 55.* Neither the *Sub-*
ject nor the *Predicate* are here to be un-
 derstood *corporeally*. So *Christ* is not en-
 tered into the *holy places made with hands*,
 which are the *figures of the true*, but *into*
Heaven it self. Heb. IX. 24. By the
emphatical connexion of Heaven it self
 immediately with the mention of the
true holy place it plainly appears that the
 Apostle

Ch. 11. Apostle understood them as *synonymous*. According therefore to this *Mystical Way* of speaking the *Heavenly Invisible Sacrifice* offered by the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{G}}$ in *Heaven* will be the *true Sacrifice* from whence all *Corporeal Sacrifices* must derive their claim that would pretend to the *name* of *Sacrifices*.

Señ. 10. BUT then there seems indeed to have been this difference between the *Notions* of the *Christians*, and the *Hellenists*, in this matter. The *Hellenists* who knew nothing of the *Incarnation* of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{G}}$, nor consequently the *Sacrifice* of his *human Body*, did notwithstanding conceive him to officiate in *Heaven* as a *Priest*, and there to offer *Invisible Sacrifices*. What could those *Sacrifices* be but the *Sacrifices* of the *Brutes* performed here below by the *Priest*, only *represented* in a more *spiritual* manner? But there the whole *Benefit* was to be ascribed to the *invisible Sacrifice*, not only on that general Principle received among them, that all *Corporeal Beings* were derived from their *Incorporeal Ideas*, so that the *spiritual Representation* was not derived from the *Corporeal Sacrifice*, but on the contrary; but also because the *external Sacrifice* of *Brutes*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 319

Brutes was indeed *unsuitable* to the *Bene- Ch. II.*
fit expected from it, of expiating *Sin*,
even upon a *Corporeal* Account. On the
contrary our Saviour's *External Sacrifice*
was *suitable*, and therefore if it any
way depended on the *invisible Representation*,
it must only be on this general
account, as this *Corporeal Body* (as I
may speak properly according to this
Hypothesis) was derived from the *In-*
corporeal, as the *Body* offered on the *Cross*
was derived from the *Body prepared for*
him before time in the *Divine Decree*.
However it had certainly this advantage
above all other *Corporeal Sacrifices*, that
the virtue of this was derived *immediate-*
ly from the *Incorporeal*, the virtue of all
other *Sacrifices* only *mediately* as they
were *Representations* of this. And this
was accordingly their Doctrine, that
the virtue of all the *Jewish Sacrifices* was
to be derived *immediately*, even from
this *Corporeal Sacrifice* of *Christ* upon the
Cross, as the virtue of an *unsuitable Cor-*
poreal Sacrifice was to be resolved into
that of a *suitable* one, tho *Corporeal*
also. This therefore being so, it plainly
followed, that this *Corporeal Sacrifice*
of our Saviour on the *Cross* had the same
relation to all other *Corporeal* ones as the
Incorporeal

Ch. II. *Incorporeal Sacrifice* had to *Corporeal* ones in general, and therefore on the same account deserved the name of the *true Sacrifice* among *Corporeal* ones, as the *Incorporeal* did simply.

Sect. II. **THIS** was also a *Consequence* admitted by them who *reasoned* on this *Hypothesis*. The *Manna* which came down

In *g. plast* *id* from *Heaven*, was, without doubt, *Cor-*
our *clef* *ed* *semi* *poreal*, and yet it is called the *true Bread*
our *is* *call* *d* *g.* as descending from *Heaven*, *S. Fohn* VI.
trist *manna*, 31, 32. as more *immediately* *Copied* from
and *tr* *ously* the *Incorporeal Ideal Manna* which these
Mystical *Discourses* took to be the food
of *Angels*. Thus all the *Legal Ceremo-*
nies are said to be *figures* of the *true*,
Heb. IX. 24. because all things beset
them in a *Figure* (as the *Vulgar* has it)
and were written for our *Admonition*, up-
on whom the ends of the world are come,
1 *Cor.* X. 6, 11. And this I take to be the
true Reason, why the *Gospel*, in oppo-
sition to the *Law*, is called the *Truth*.
The *Law* was given by *Moses*, but *Grace*
and *Truth* came by *Fesus Christ*: *John* I.
17. and in the whole *Reasonings* of the
Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and those of *S.*
Fohn. Because the whole *external State*
of the *Law* was indeed a *Representation*
of the whole *external State* of the *Gospel*

as

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 321

as that which was indeed more *suitable*, Ch. 11⁷
in the whole contrivance of it, for the
real exhibition of those things which
were only *shadowed* in the *Law*. And
this was agreeable to the practice of the
Platonists, from whom the *Christians* re-
ceived it, to give the names of *Originals*
to *inferior Beings* in comparison of *other*
Beings inferior to themselves. Thus
they make the *Son* a λόγος in respect of
the *Father*, but a ὄψις in respect of *Man*,
as also *Man* a ὄψις in respect of *inferior*
Beings, but a λόγος in respect of the *Son*.
So they make the *Son* only an εἰκὼν in re-
spect of the *Father*, but an *Original* in
respect of all *others*, whence the name of
αὐτέθεος, αὐτόφως, αὐτοαλήθεια, &c. And
even the ἄνθρωπος σοφίας, tho it be a
Divinity in regard of *other inferior Be-*
ings, yet is made an εἰκὼν only in respect
of the *Son*, and an εἰκὼν εἰκὼνος in re-
spect of the *Father*. Accordingly the
Externals of the *Gospel* may be only τύποι
in respect of the *Heavenly Originals*, and
yet ἀλήθεια as *Archetypal* to all other *Ex-*
ternals even of *Divine Institution*. To
make application therefore of my pre-
sent Subject, and withal to speak *suita-*
bly to the now described Principles, the
first Archetypal Sacrifice of all *visible*
Y. ones

Ch. 11. ones will be that of our Saviour on the Cross, and of all others each will have the better Title to the name of a Sacrifice, as it comes nearer to that. If therefore the Eucharist be the immediate $\tau\upsilon\pi\omega$ Copied out from that, as the Christians then supposed all the Externals of the Gospel to be more immediate; then it will follow that the Legal Sacrifices themselves cannot otherwise challenge the name of Sacrifices than as they are Copied from the Eucharist as that which was immediately shadowed by them. And in this way of Reasoning, as the Eucharist, on account of its being the Copy which was imitated in the ancient Popular Sacrifices, will have a better Title to the Name of Truth, as being that of which the ancient Sacrifices were indeed Resemblances; so it will have a juster claim to the very name of a Sacrifice, on account of its being a Mystical One.

Sect. 10. AND as to the name, so also to the thing. In truth all Title to the Name ought to be grounded on the nature of the thing. That will best deserve the name of a Sacrifice which best performs the Office, and confers the Benefits designed in the use of a Sacrifice. This is agreeable

Sacrificia
maxima in lege
erat $\tau\upsilon\pi\omega$ non
Eucharistia sed
sacrificij Christi
in cruce. dict
pag. 324.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 323

agreeable to the *reason* of the *thing*, and *Ch. 11.*
 was so also to the *sentiments* of those
Ancients who used this way of *Reason-*
ing. They therefore ascribed the *Truth*
 to these *Archetypal Beings*, because they
 thought them *really* to perform the *Of-*
fice signified by the *name*. Nay more,
 they did not think the *sensible Beings* to
 have any *real* influence in performing it,
 but that whatever *efficacy* they had was
 to be wholly ascribed to the *Relation* they
 had to these *Originals*. In which way
 of *Reasoning* the greatest *Mysteries* must
 be most effectual, and by how much
 the more *Mystical* any thing is; that is,
 by how much nearer any thing ap-
 proaches the first *Archetypal Beings*
 of all, by so much the more effica-
 cious it must be proportionably. And
 thus the *Eucharist* coming nearer the
 first *Archetypal visible Sacrifice*, that of
 our Saviour upon the Cross, must there-
 fore have more efficacy, even as a *Sacri-*
fice, than those which represented it
 only at a distance, as the Jewish *Sacri-*
fices did. So the Apostle seems to rea-
 son in a like Case, That because the *Ta-*
bernacle was only a *Figure for the time*
then present, therefore the *Gifts and Sa-*
crifices that were offered in it could not make

Heb. IX. 9.

Ch. II. him who did the service perfect. And again, That the Law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very Image of the things, αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς πραγματείας, could never with those Sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. It could not have been his design, because it was not for his Interest, to deny the efficacy of the Institutions of the Law in order to the Benefits designed by it. That had been to have reflected on the Divine Institutions, even for the Seasons for which they were appointed. His design therefore must have been so to grant the efficacy of those appointments to them who lived under that Dispensation, as notwithstanding to oblige them to receive the Gospel when it should be revealed and proposed to them. And that he does very sufficiently by shewing that whatever efficacy they had, even in their season, was notwithstanding not derived from themselves, but from their Evangelical Originals which were represented by them. This did indeed oblige them to receive the Evangelical Originals for their own sake, when they had already received the Legal Representations only for their Relation to them, that is,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 325

is, to receive that Power *immediately* Ch. 11. from *themselves* which, on this supposition, they could not have received from those *Legal Representations* any otherwise than as *influenced by them*.

NOW this he proves from this *Sect. 13.* Principle of the *Hellenistical Platonists*, that the *Archetypal Beings* were the *Causes* of all particulars, the *αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπου* of all particular *ἀνθρώποι*, the *αὐτοζών* of all particular *ζῶαι* received, and that the *Ectypal Beings* had no other influence in producing others of the same kind, than what was received from the *Archetypal*. Supposing therefore that the *Institutions* of *Moses* were not *Originals*, but *Copies*, (which they proved from that *command* to *Moses* that he should make all things *according to the Pattern* shewed him *in the Mount*) supposing also that the *Institutions* of the *Gospel* were indeed those *Originals* from whence those *Legal* ones were *Copied*, which was the main thing aimed at in all those *Mystical Reasonings* of the *Primitive Christians*; these two Consequences plainly followed, “Both that
“the *Legal Institutions* did not perform
“what they were designed for by any
“*Native Virtue* of their *own*, and that

Ch. II. "whatever was performed by them,
 "was no otherwise performed by them
 "than as the influences of the *Evangelical*
 "*Originals* were derived by such in-
 "stituted Representations. And it was
 very agreeably hercunto that the *Evangelical*
Originals are usually called ever-
 lasting, the *Legal Representations* only
 Temporary. Thus the Gospel was called
 the *Everlasting Gospel*, the *Evangelical*
Covenant, the *Everlasting Covenant*, the
Righteousness of the Gospel, an *Everlast-*
ing Righteousness, and the *Redemption*
 of the Gospel answering that of the *Jews*
 out of *Egypt* (is called an *eternal Re-*
demption, and the *Evangelical Inheri-*
tance (answering the *Jewish Canaan*)
 is an *eternal Inheritance*, and the *Legal*
Tabernacle a *Figure* for the time then
 present. The very same attribute of
 αἰώνιος was by the *Platonists* ascribed to
 their *Idea*, and the same *Temporarieness*
 to their *Ectypal Beings*. Nor was this
 Notion of αἰώνιος understood only as it
 might signify εἰς τὸς αἰῶνας, or what we
 call *Eternity a parte post*, as the *Insti-*
tutions of the Gospel were to last to the
 συντέλεια τῆς αἰῶνος, whereas those of the
Law were, at first, designed no further
 than the *later days*. It was also under-
 stood

Rev. XIV.

6.

Heb. XIII.

20

Dan. IX.

24

Heb. IX.

32.

V. 15.

A. 8. XV.

18.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 327

stood as it signified ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, or Ch. II.
 what we call *Eternity a parte ante*,
 which is the same with that Phrase of
 the *New Testament*, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς τοῦ
 κόσμου, so often used to express the *An-*
tiquity of Evangelical Institutions, as the Heb. I. 2.
 καταβολὴ κόσμου is the same thing with
 the *making* of the αἰῶνες. This was also a
 thing insisted on by the *Primitive Christi-*
ans for vindicating their Religion from the aspersions of *Novelty* with
 which it was upbraided by Adversaries of both sorts, both *Jews* and *Heathens*.
 This they proved by shewing that the
 Institutions of the *Gospel* were *presigured*
 and so *predicted* before the *Law of Moses*,
 that even in the *Law*, these were they
 which were designed by those *Legal*
Shadows, and from which the *Legal Rites*
 themselves derived their Influences. By
 all which it appears how solidly the *Primitive Christians*
 proceeded in grounding their Discourses against *SCHISM* on this
 supposition, that the *Christian Eucharist*
 was the *Christian Sacrifice*, and to all
 material intents and purposes the more
 properly and more effectually, for being
 a *Mystical One*.

C H A P. XII.

The same Christians did, and, by the same Principles, were obliged to, own their Bishops for Mystical High Priests.

The CONTENTS.

The Bishops were thought to represent a Divine Person. The seven Angels of the Divine Presence had their Office in the restoring of Souls. Sect. I. To these S. John accommodated his precise number of seven Churches in Asia. Sect. II. Sometimes the Bishops represented the Person of Christ himself, and then his seven Angels are represented by the seven Deacons. Sect. III. How fitly this agreed to the Circumstances of the first Beginnings of Christianity. Sect. IV. The name Bishop seems originally designed to imply a Mystical Representative of a Divine Person. Sect. V. The Comparisons of the Bishops in Ignatius to God, and Christ, &c. accounted for. Sect. VI. The Mystical

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 329

stical Representations of Ecclesiastical Ch. 12.

Officers in the Revelations. Sect. VII.

There could be no Mistake in taking their Church-Officers for Mystical Representatives. Sect. VIII.

The force of the Inference relating to Union with Christian Bishops. Sect. IX.

Tertullian's Futuri Judicii Præjudicium explained. Sect. X.

How consequently the Primitive Christians reasoned hence for proving those who were disunited from their Bishops to be also deprived of the Mystical Invisible Union with Christ himself. Sect. XI.

And of the Benefits of that Invisible Union. Sect. XII, XIII, XIV.

AND as they thus took the Eucha- Sect. 1.
rist for a *Mystical Sacrifice*, so they also took their *Bishops* for *Mystical High Priests*. I have already shewn that they conceived their *Bishops* to be answerable to the *Levitical High Priesthood*. I now proceed to shew that they understood them answerable in a *Mystical Sense*. I observed that the *Hierophanta* in the *Mysteries* represented a *Divine Person*. The same, in all probability, were the thoughts of the *Primitive Christians*,

Ch. 12. *Christians concerning their Bishops.* This I take to be the true design of that Description of the *Majestatick Presence* in the *Revelations*, to represent the *Divine Presence* and *Assistance* in the Church in as lively a way as was possible according to the ways of *Mystical Representation* received in those times. In the Utensils of the *Tabernacle* there were to be *seven*

De Vit.

Mos. L.III.

p.455.456.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Ed. Turneb.

Lamps. *Exod. XXV. 37.* These *Philo* understands to represent the *seven Pla-*
nets, and indeed very suitably to the
Notions of the *Egyptian Philosophy* then
received. The *seven Spheres* belonging
to them made up the *Harmonia* through
which they thought the Soul was to
pass in its *ἀνοδος* & its *Ascent* to its *Hea-*
venly Original. And as they thought
that the *confinement* of the Soul to these
inferior Regions depended on the *Gross-*
ness of the *Vehicles* to which it was *nail-*
ed (*περσῆλωσις*, if I mistake not, is their
word) by their *passions*; so they thought
that at the passage of each of these it
was to leave some *Vehicle* and some *Pas-*
sion behind it, what was to be left at each
is particularly accounted for in the
Pæmand. c. *Pæmander of Hermes.* But then, as in
all the *sensible World* they made some-
thing answerable in the *Intellectual*
which

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

Pæmand. c.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 331

which was to preside in managing that whole design for which those *sensible* parts were *intended* by God, so here also they placed seven *Spirits*, or *Demons*, or *Angels*, for that purpose of *admitting* and *purging* the *Soul* from those things which were thought to hinder the *Soul* in its *Ascent*. These I take to be the seven *Angels* so usually received by, not only the *Modern Jews*, but those also who lived in the *first* Beginnings of *Christianity* (still alluded to as the peculiar *Satellites* of the *Divine Presence*, and employed only on Affairs of the greatest consequence) and that even in the *Sacred Writings* themselves. And because they were so concerned in transacting the *Soul's* passage to *Heaven*, therefore the several *Speeches* of the *Souls* to them are transcribed from the ancient *Hereticks* (who took occasion for most of their Heresies from some misapplication of that *Philosophy*) in *Origen*. Therefore the *νεμενς* or *Petasis*, in allusion to that of *Mercury* in the *Poets*, which *Sophia* was to put on her *Seed*, to make them *invisible* to those *Angels* in the Doctrine of the *Valentinians*, that I may not instance in other fancies of the *Hereticks* of those times alluding to

Ch. 12.

Contr. Cels.
L.VI.p.
296.Ed.
Cantabrig.

Ch. 12. to these Notions as commonly received.

Therefore it is that the Orders of *Angels* are said to be βελτιωτικαὶ and φωτιστικαὶ of those below them in reference to the initiating them in these great *Mysteries*, alluding to the φωτισμός used in the ordinary *Mysteries*, as *Fire* and *Light* in the *Ebren* Idiom signifie the same thing, and accordingly *Prometheus's* stealing *Fire* from the *Chariot* of the *Sun* is nothing else but his ἔκθεξις of these *Mysteries*. And as this is granted concerning all *Superior Orders* in reference to their *Inferiors*; so, on this *Hypothesis*, it appears how particularly it was applicable to these seven *Angels* in relation to the initiating of *human Souls*.

Seet. 2. AND as these *Mysteries* were principally designed for the Benefit of *Souls*, their κατέδωκε, or return from their *Exile* from *Heaven*; so from hence it appears how proper it was in these *Prophetick Visions*, which were generally conducted by *Mystical Representations*, to personate *God* as particularly attended by these seven *Angels* rather than any of the rest of his train. Accordingly *S. Fohn's* Design being particularly to affect the *Churches* he writes to, those of the *Lydian* or *Proconsular Asia*, with a very

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 333

very feeling *sense* of the *Divine Presence* Ch. 12. among them (which might add the greater authority to his several Exhortations respectively) he represents our *Saviour* in a *human* visible shape ; and that the rest of the Scene might be suitable (that is, *sensible* also as well as himself) he personates the *Angels* by their *Visible Bishops*, that so *Christ* might be apprehended as present with the *Bishops* as *God* was supposed to be where ever these seven *Spirits* were which were peculiarly deputed to represent the *Majestick Presence*. This I take to be the reason why he confines his *number*, not that by any *Geographical* Distinction those seven *Cities* were incorporated into a *Body* more than others of that *Province*, but that he had a particular regard to that *number* of those *Angels* of the *Presence*. Therefore he makes seven *Candlesticks*, alluding, as I said, to the like number of those in the *Tabernacle* as Emblems of these seven *Churches*, Vers. 13. Therefore seven *Stars*, alluding to the number of the *Planets*, and the *Angels* who presided over them, as Emblems of the *Bishops* of those *Churches*. Therefore those *Stars* are in his *Right Hand*, to signify his care and concernment.

Ch. 12. concernment for their Protection, and to conciliate a greater reverence for their *Authority*. Thus it appears plainly that the *Bishops* are here represented in a *Mystical Way*; and how particularly suitable it was, in this way, to personate them by the name of *Angels*. They were indeed to perform the same Office under *Christ* as a *visible human person*, which the *Angels* were under him as the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$, in reference to the *Restitution* of *Souls* to their *Original Dignity*. The pretended *Areopagite*, than whom perhaps none better understood the *Mystical Language* of the *Hellenistical Philosophy* of that *Age*, uses the same Expressions concerning them as concerning those *Angels*, that these are also $\phi\omega\pi\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$ and $\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\omega\pi\iota\omicron\iota$ and $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\pi\iota\omicron\iota$. And so also does *Clemens Alexandrinus*. In one place he calls the *three Orders* of the Church, *Bishops, Priests* and *Deacons*,

Strom. VI.
p. 283. Ed.
Sylburg

Strom. VII.
init. p. 297.
35.

$\mu\mu\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\eta\varsigma$ $\delta\delta\omicron\varsigma\eta\varsigma$, *Imitations of the Angelical Glory*. And he elsewhere gives his Explication wherein that Imitation consisted, $\kappa\tau\iota$ $\tau\omega$ $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\alpha\nu$, $\tau\eta\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega$ $\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\omega\pi\iota\kappa\iota\omega$ $\omicron\iota$ $\pi\tau\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota$ $\pi\acute{\omega}\zeta\sigma\iota\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omicron\nu\alpha$ \cdot $\tau\omega$ $\upsilon\pi\eta\tau\epsilon\tau\iota\kappa\omega$ η , $\omicron\iota$ $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$. $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omega$ $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$ $\tau\epsilon$ $\upsilon\pi\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ $\tau\alpha\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omega}$ $\kappa\tau\iota$ $\tau\eta\nu$

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 335.

τὴν ᾠρυέων ἀκονομίαν. *In the Church the Ch. 12.*

Presbyters bear the resemblance of the bettering Office, as the Deacons do of that of Service. The Angels perform both these Services to God in the Administration of the Terrestrial World. No doubt the Bishops, in this Dichotomy are comprehended under the common name of Presbyters, and comparing this later place with the former it must needs have been so. But of this I have elsewhere given an account.

THIS was the properest way, I *Sect. 3.* think, that could have been thought of for representing *Christ* as the *Invisible Bishop* presiding among the *Bishops*. But because even his *human nature*, tho' *visible* in it self, is yet *invisible* to *Us*, therefore another way was thought of for copying out that Heavenly *πλετη*, even in the ordinary *external visible* Government of the *Church*. And here the *Bishop* was to personate *Christ* himself as the *High Priest* had formerly represented the *Λόγος*. The seven *Deacons* were to represent the seven *Mystical Angels*, as I am very apt to think they were designed from the very Original. I cannot think it casual that the *number* first pitched on was exactly *seven*. But that *AR. VI. 3.*
which

Ch. 12. which more confirms me in this opinion is the real *suitableness* of the Office of the *Deacons* to the *Bishop* as representing the λόγος in a *visible* way, with that of those *Angels* to the same λόγος as he was *invisible*. The Office of the *Angels* in general is thus described by the Author to the *Ebrews*, that they are λείτεργικά πνεύματα, εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστέλλόμενα. These are exactly the very terms by which the Church would have expressed the Office of these *Deacons*, if she had been to have described the same Office as vested in *mortal men*. And I know not whether that expression concerning the διακονία πνεύματος do not allude to this, that even the *Holy Ghost* himself, in distributing his *Gifts*, did exercise the Office of one of those ordinary λείτεργικά πνεύματα. And indeed the Office of those *inferior Demons* was proportionably the same according to the Notions of the *Hellenistical Philosophy*. As the first Institution of the Office of *Deaconship* was for the distributing the *Treasures* of the Church, so it was also taken for the Office of those *Angels* to convey the *spiritual Treasures* (those *Gifts* and *Largesses* which *Christ* bestowed on *Men* upon his *Ascension* in allusion to the

Congiaria

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 337

Congiararia bestowed by the *Roman Emperors* in their *Triumphal Ascent* to the *Capitol*) to *Men*, as well as to offer and present the *Sacrifices* and *Prayers* of *Men* to *God*. They were to stand before the

Tob. XII.
15. Lat.

Presence of *God*, in a posture of readiness to be sent on *Messages* by him, and so were the *Deacons* to stand before the *Bishop*, to be sent by him on his *Messages*. They were the eyes of the Lord which run to and fro through the whole earth. Zach. III. 9. IV. 10. So also the *Deacons* are, in the Language of the ancient Church, called the *Oculi Episcopi*, for the same reason. They were to present the *Prayers* of the Faithful before *God*. Tob. XII. 15. Gr. Rev. VIII. 3. And the same Office of presenting the *Prayers* was peculiarly the *Deacons* in the *Primitive Church*. But of all Offices that of being sent on *Errands* seems to have been the most intrinsic to the notion of a *Deacon* in the notions of those times. Thus it was synonymous with the name of *Apostle*. *Εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστολῶν* are exegetical of each other in the forementioned passage of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*. *Fudas's Apostleship* is called his *διακονία*, Act. I. 17. and not only so but his *ἐπισκοπὴ*, Verse 20.

Ch. 12. as the very *Episcopal Office* was to be a *διακονία* in reference to *Christ* in the comparison now described. The *Apostles* themselves were to give themselves to the *διακονία λόγῳ*, *Act. VI. 4.* even after the institution of *Deacons*. And *S. Paul* calls his *Apostleship* his *διακονία*, *Act. XX. 24. Rom. XI. 13.* *Archippus's Bishoprick* is his *διακονία*, *Col. IV. 17.* So is that of *S. Timothy*, *2 Tim. IV. 5.* So is that of the *Angel* of the *Church of Thyatira*, *Rev. II. 19.* That now we may not wonder why the *Bishops* are called *Angels* in the forementioned *Mystical* immediate Relation to our *Saviour* himself the *chief Bishop of our Souls*: *1 S. Pet. XI. 25.* Because indeed in regard of him they bear no higher Office than that of *Deacon*. And this same Office of being sent on *Errands* was indeed the principal employment of these *Angels of the Presence*, especially in Affairs of so great importance and honor as this was of the *Gospel*.

Sect. 4. ACCORDINGLY the *Primitive Church* were extremely rigorous in insisting on this very number of their *Deacons* in all places, as I have elsewhere shewed. The Council of *Neocæsarea* imposed it as a *Universal Rule*, how great

1 Tim. I.
12.
Let. II. to
Mr. Baxter.
Sect. 57.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 339

great soever the *Church* were to which *Ch. 12*
the *Deacons* were to serve. Certainly
they would not have ventured a Change
of that Consequence in the Government
in a *Canon* (which, tho it were at first
designed only for their own *Province* of
Cappadocia, was notwithstanding after-
wards extended first to the *Eastern Em-
pire* by being taken into the *Eastern Code*
composed between the times of the
Councils of *C.P.* and *Ephesus*, and quoted
as a commonly received Authority in the
Council of *Chalcedon*, and afterwards
to the *Western Empire* when it was also
taken into the *Roman Code* by *Dionysius
Exiguus*) but by conforming the fewer
Deviations to a *Rule* already more ge-
nerally received. And therefore even
then it is much more probable that this
number was already received in more
Churches than otherwise. But in the *Rea-
soning* now insisted on, as most generally
used in those *Times*, of keeping close to
Jewish Precedents, excepting only such
Instances whereof they could give an ac-
count of the *Change*, from the *Old
Testament* it self, I cannot think of any
Reason so probable why the numbers of
the *Christian Deacons* was so limited,
whereas the *Jewish Levites* were so un-
restrained,

Ch. 12. restrained, as this of their being designed in imitation of the *attendant Angels*. And on this supposition, the account which may be given will be this. When the *Levites* were first instituted there was as yet no *knowledge* of any particular *number* of *Angels* allotted to this purpose, and therefore the *number* of the *Levites* might well be *indefinite*, because, by the *Revelations* then made, the *number* of the *Angels* might have been so also. But the same *Analogy* of *Reasoning* required that the *number* of the *Christian Levites* should answer the *number* of these *Angels* of the *Presence* as then received in the time of the *Gospel Institution*, especially such as were so received on account of *Old Testament Revelations*, tho later than the times of *Moses*, yet *ancienter* than the *Gospel*, and so actually understood then by the generality even of the *Jews* themselves. This does therefore also most probably *suppose* that the *Deacons* were thought *mystically* to represent that *number* of the *Seven Angels* on the account now mentioned. It may be the same thing also was alluded to in other the like *Establishments* in those *Eastern Parts*. This very number was exactly observed in a
Supreme

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 341

Supreme Council of *State* among the *Ch.* 12.

Persians, as appears not only from the famous Story of the Seven who conspired against the *Magi*, who were all equal by the places which they already possessed, the reason why they pitched upon that way of the *Neighing* of their *Horses* for chusing an *Heir to the Crown*, but also from the Book of *Esther*. There they are called the *Wise Men* who knew *Esh I. 13.*
the times, the seven *Princes of Persia* and *Media*, who saw the King's Face, an expression exactly answering that concerning those *Angels*, *S. Matth. XVIII. 10.* and in the *Fragments of Orpheus* ;
 Σὺ δὲ θεῶν πρεσβυτέρῳ παρῆσθαι πολυμήχοι
 ἄγγελοι, &c. and their Title of being *Angels of the Presence*. And the same was the number of the *Governors of the Jewish Cities*, if we may believe *Josephus*, tho I know we are told other things by the *Talmudical Jews*. *14.*

AND this I take also to be the true *Sect. 5.*
 Original of the name ἑπισκοπῶν. I know what other Notions are commonly taken notice of from the practices of that Age. The *Athenian* ἑπισκοπεῖ were *Itinerant Officers* sent to oversee the Affairs of the *Cities* subject to their Jurisdiction, answerable to the *Lacedæmonian* *Suid.* ἑπιστάται.

Ch. 12. *monian ἀρμοσαί.* Something of the like nature was that *Episcopatus* of the Sea-Coast of *Campania*, which *Tully* says was committed to himself by *Pompey*. It was no other than a care of guarding that Sea-Coast, not fixed to any one certain place, but obliging him to a readiness to defend all. That which comes nearest to the Case of the *Christian Episcopacy* is that of *Philopæmen*, who, as *Appian* tells us, was made *ἑπισκοπὸς τῆς ἑφεσίων* by *Mithridates*. Here seems to have been a particular *Bishop* of a *City* and the *Jurisdiction* of it, to inspect the behaviour of the *Citizens* in relation to *Mithridates*. But none of all these were *Sacred*, but only *Civil Officers*. None of them seem to have been received in all *Cities*, but only in *subject* ones, nor in all those neither, but such only as had a *Magistracy* and *Government* of their own, and a *Power* of the *Sword* within themselves, and then especially even in those, when their *Superiors* had some particular ground of *Jealousie* concerning them. Much less was any of them so universally received in the *Sacred Administration*; either of the *Jewish Synagogues* or the *Heathen Temples* at the times of the first beginnings of *Christianity*, as to be any likely

In Mithridatic.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 343

likely occasion why this name should *Ch. 12.*
have been universally imitated in the
new Establishments of the *Christian*
Church. I therefore rather take it to
have been a design of *Mystically* repre-
senting the *Presence* of *God* in the *Go-*
vernment of his *Church*, in the *Person* of
his *Bishop*. For thus as the name of
ἐπίσκοπος properly signifies an *Over-*
seer, so the *Providence* of *God* is expres-
sed by his *inspecting* things below. Thus
the Eyes of the Lord are over the Right-
eous, and an *Eye* was the *Symbol* of
Providence in the *Egyptian Hierogly-*
phicks. By which it appears how suita-
bly those *Spirits* which are made to be
the Eyes of the Lord in *Zachary* are made
the *Symbols* of the *Bishops* in the *Revela-*
tions. And as *all* the *Heathen Deities*,
especially the *Supreme* are, (as *Macro-*
bins has observed, no doubt, from the
Stoicks) reduced to the *Sun* ; so it is the
Character of the *Sun*, ὡς πάντ' ἐφορεῖ.
And in the Language of that Age the
Tutelar Demon was the ἐπίσκοπος δαί-
μων, and the *Supreme Being* is πανεπί-
σκοπος ἡμῶν in the *Sibylline Oracles*. The
Gods of the *Pagi* are called ἐπίσκοποι in
Halicarnassus, and the *Nymphs* are
ναμαδάτων ἐπίσκοποι in *Aristides*. And to

Saturnal.

Arist. Hym.
in Jov. P.
1.

Ch. 12. shew that this Title is indeed derived from *God*, even when it is applyed to *Men*; therefore it is oftentimes applyed to *God himself*, and the whole obligation to reverence it even in *Men*, is derived from the concernment of *God* for them as his *Representatives*. So our *Saviour* himself is called *the Bishop of our Souls*. And *Polycarp*, in *Ignatius*, is said to be not so much ἐπίσκοπος, but μὲν οὖν ἐπισκοπήμενος, implying *God* to be the *Bishop* to whom the Irreverences would, by Interpretation, redound, which were offered to *Polycarp* himself. A strange thing that *Blondel* should understand this as a reflection on *Polycarp*, which was indeed designed to render his *Authority* more awful. As for *Ignatius*, he elsewhere uses it, and uses this same notion for the same design, not as a curb upon the *Bishop*, but upon his *Subjects*, that they might not presume upon him. *Damas* Bishop of the *Magnesians*, was a young man. This might make his Clergy and People too bold with him. But he warns them to have a care of abusing his Age, but rather to shew him all respect as other holy Presbyters had done, ἐν αὐτῷ ὃ, ἀλλὰ τὰς παλαιὰς ἰουδαίας καὶ τοὺς πάλαιον ἐπισκόπους. Accordingly he adds

Ep. ad
Polyc. in
Tit.

Ep. ad
Magnes.
Sect. 3.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 345

adds that, for the honor of him who had *Ch. 12.*
 required this at their hands, they ought
 to pay their duty without dissimulation.
 If they should do otherwise, he shews
 who would resent and punish it; ὅχ' ὅτι
 ἡ ἐπίσκοπον τῶτον ἡ βλεπόμενον πλανᾷ τις,
 ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀόρατον ~~ὁ~~ θαυματοῦται. τὸ ἡ τοιᾶ,
 τον ἡ πρὸς σάρκα ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ πρὸς θεόν,
 ἡ τὰ κρύφια εἰδὼτα. The reasoning is no
 other than what I have elsewhere shewn *Sep. prov.*
 was ordinarily used, in that Age, on *Schism.ch.*
 the like occasions. The deceit used by *14.*
Ananias and *Sapphira* to the *Apostles*,
 in not bringing the whole price of the *A. V. 3.*
 Land they pretended to sell for charita-
 ble uses, is called a *lying* to the *Holy*
Ghost, nay, even as to the *negative* ex-
 pression of *Ignatius*, a *lying not unto men* *Verse 4.*
 but unto God. As the like expression
 had been also used in the case of the
Israelites murmuring against *Moses* and
Aaron. Thus therefore it appears that
 the *Bishop* was understood and designed
 to represent a *Sacred Person* after the
 custom of the *Mysteries* received in those
 times.

AND now the *Comparisons* of the *Sect. 6.*
Bishops in *Ignatius* cannot seem so
 strange, these things being considered,
 as

Ch. 12. as they did to *Blondell* who had considered none of them. They are generally designed to express the *Sacredness* and *excellency* of the *Persons* which the *Clergy* bore in these *Mystical Performances*. Nor is there any thing in them that is really *affected* or *strained*, much less *blasphemous*, no nor any *extravagant flights of fancy*, as they who have read them without a kindness for them, and much more who have read them without this *Clew*, have hitherto conceived them. When he was to express the correspondence between the *Cælestial* and *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* (as I have shewn that the *virtue* of all *Mystical Performances* was to be derived from this *correspondence*) it was very proper sometimes to make the *comparison* sometimes with the *Invisible Originals*, as I have shewn that the *Jewish Sacrifices* did not only answer the *Invisible Sacrifice* offered by the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\Theta$ in *Heaven*, but also the *visible* one offered by the same $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\Theta$ as incarnate on the *Cross*, and that the *virtue* of those *visible Sacrifices* was to be judged by the nearness of their *approach*, not only to that *invisible* one, but also to that *first* of those which were *visible*. If he was to compare

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 347

compare them with the *first invisible Ch. 12.*
Archetypes of Unity (as that is indeed his great design in those Epistles in opposition to the *SCHISMS* then rising) then it was very proper for him to take notice only of the *two Orders* which were then immediately concerned in the Office of Ministration, and then to compare them with *God the Father*, and the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$, because as this *Unity* consists in the *Unity* of the *Head*, and the Scripture tells us that the *Head* of every *Man* is *Christ*: so also the same Scripture tells us that the *Head* of *Christ* is *God*. Besides that the Title of $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\textcircled{\circ}$ is oftentimes ascribed to the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$ in reference to the $\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ in the Hypothesis of that Age, not with any design of signifying any *Inferiority* of *Nature*, but only of *Office* and *Subordination*. If therefore, by his *Office* he was a $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\textcircled{\circ}$ who could be more fit than *he* to personate the *Archetypal* $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\textcircled{\circ}$, who was here *Archetypal* to that of the seven *Angels* themselves already mentioned? And who fitter than the *Father* to represent the $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\textcircled{\circ}$ to such a $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\textcircled{\circ}$ as this? Nor can it be thought strange that there should be *several* gradual intellectual *Archetypes* as there were among those

Ch. 12. those which were *sensible*. But when his design is to compare the *Ecclesiastical Judicatory* to the *first* which was *sensible*, *Deacons* were not as yet instituted; and therefore the only comparison remaining was between *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and the *Bishops* with their *Presbyteries*. And then who sees not how aptly the *Bishops* will answer *Christ* himself, as *presiding* over their own *Presbyteries* the same way as *Christ* did over his *Apostles*? In each of these comparisons one *Order* is omitted, the *Deacons* in the later, and the *Presbyters* in the former. Why the *Deacons* are omitted, the Reason is already given. Why the *Presbyters* are, the reason may be that they are sometimes reckoned as *one Order* with the *Bishop*, by those who never thought of any *Parity* therein, that is, by such who do as expressly reckon *three Orders* upon other occasions. Thus many of the most ancient Fathers, as their Testimonies are produced by *Blondell* himself. And thus *Philo* before them sometimes reckons the *High Priest* in the same *Order* with the *common Priests*, sometimes he makes him a *distinct Order* by himself. So that notwithstanding the *Bishops* being of the same *Order* with *Presbyters*, he might however

Vid. Differ.
Cypr. ad Ep.
Cypr.
XXXIII.

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 349

however have as great a *pre-eminence* Ch. 12.
above them on account of his *place* as the
High Priest had above the *Ordinary*
Priests, which is as much as they *do* or
need desire. However in the *same Order*
the *Bishop* only as a *Head* is concerned
as a *Representative* of the *Mystical Unity*
which is the main thing designed in
these *Comparisons*. Which is a *rea-*
son not agreeing to the *common Pres-*
byter.

Sect. 7.

HOWEVER because, on other
occasions, they reckoned them as *distinct*
Orders, therefore there are not wanting
such *Mystical Representations* of the *Hea-*
venly Hierarchy as make it exactly an-
swerable to the *Ecclesiastical*, even in this
particular also. Thus S. *John* in the
Sixth Chapter of his *Revelations* repre-
sents him who sate upon the *Throne*,
the very expression used concerning the
Bishops, even in those *Primitive Times*.
Then, as the *Presbyters* used to *sit*;
and to sit on Seats ordered in a *Hemicycle*
about the *Bishop* within the *Chancel*, or
ἀγίον βῆμα, or Δυσαστήριον, so here
are represented twenty four *Elders*
sitting likewise on *Thrones* about the
the *Throne* of the *Lamb*. That they
were designed for *Priests* appears from
the

Ch. 12. the circumstances of their *Representation*. They are cloathed in *White Raiment*, answering the *Linnen Ephod* among the *Jews*, Verse 4. They have also *Viats* full of *Odors*, which are interpreted to be the *Prayers of the Saints*, and *Harpes* to sing the *Hymns* which were usually joyned with the *Sacrifices*, Chap. V. 8. What is this else but exactly the *Office* of ordinary *Priests* in those *Times*? That therefore they had also *Crowns*, Chap. IV. 4. &c. is only to intimate their being a *Royal Priesthood*, which was one of the *Glories* pretended to by the *Literal Israel*, and therefore, by the *Reasoning* then used, more justly claimable by that which was *mystically* so. And it is thus expounded by those *Elders* themselves, Chap. V. 10. that the *Lamb* had made them *Kings* and *Priests* to their *God*. That the number is exactly twenty four, was, in all probability derived from some *Jewish Precedent*. If we might trust the *Rabbins*, this was the number of the *Elders* in ordinary *Cities*, answerably whereunto the *Great Sanhedrim* at *Jerusalem* consisting of three such as those had seventy two. And then this would very aptly fit the *Christian Presbyteries* which were ordinarily multiplied

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 351

tiplied by them according to the number of *Cities*. But because *Josephus*, who knew better than any of these *Rabbins*, owns but seven, and because those *City Presbyters* seem to have been rather for the *Civil Government* than the *Ecclesiastical* of those *Cities*; therefore as it will be more agreeable to the *Interest* of our *Cause*, so I believe it will be also to that of *Truth*, to derive it rather from an *Ecclesiastical Council* of the *High Priest*. And this might very probably be twenty four, exactly one out of each of the ἐκκλησίαι into which the *Body* of the *Jewish Priesthood* was divided. As for the *Rabbins* they are all too late to give us any certain *Information* of matters of *Fact* in that *Age*, and I cannot foresee any better *Testimonies* of that *Age* why this might not have been the precise number. Nor will it the less fit our *Hypothesis* concerning the *Christian Presbyteries*, if it be remembered, what I have proved, that *Christian Episcopacy* is only a multiplication of the *Jewish High Priesthood*. Whence it will also follow that the *Christian Presbyteries* ought to be understood as answerable to that *Sanhedrim* which immediately related to the *High Priest* himself. *Clemens Alexandrinus* conceives

Ch. 12. ceives the number of twenty four, to be the number of the *Apostles* doubled, to shew the interest that the *Gentiles*, as well as the *Fews*, were henceforth to have in the *Apostles*. Thus the *Christian Presbyteries* were mystically represented in the Vision of S. *Fohn*. As for the *Deacons*, they are also represented as formerly, by the same Vision, by the *seven Lamps*, which were the *seven Spirits of God*; Chap. IV. 5. and his *seven Eyes*, which are the *seven Spirits of God*, sent forth into all the *Earth*. Chap. V. 6. According to the Exposition which follows from what has been already proved.

Sect. 8. THUS I have shewn that the Office of *Episcopacy* was actually understood as a *Mystical Institution*. Nor yet have I descended so low as the pretended *Arcopagite* or the Times of *Constantine*. What I have insisted on has been partly from the *Apostles* themselves, partly from the freshest memory of them. So that there can be no pretending that, tho indeed they understood it so, yet they might have been mistaken in so understanding it. I have prevented this Answer by insisting only on such things as, by the *Principles of Christianity*, are not

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 353

not obnoxious to it. I have shewn that these *Notions* prevailed in the Apostles *Times*, nay, among the *Apostles* themselves, S. *John* for Example. I have shewn that, in all probability, they were *thought* of by them who either *gave* or *first* assumed the *name* of *Bishops*. And let our Brethren consider how it is possible to charge them with a *mistake* of this kind without involving the *Apostles* themselves. I have shewn that *nearer* the Apostles *Times* they were more received than *afterwards*; that proceeding on that way of *Reasoning* which must have been their only *Guide*, and that a very *secure* one, in all matters for which they had not an *express Revelation*; that *Reasoning* on the *Apostles Authority*; that *Reasoning* on those very *Principles* on account of which most of them had received their very *Christianity*, and which are indeed *fundamentally* supposed to most of the *Reasonings* of the New Testament, they could hardly avoid these things as just and certain *Consequences* by a clear and evident *Deduction*. And if after all, we cannot yet be secure, that this was the meaning designed by *God* himself; it will be hard to shew how we can be se-

A a cure,

Ch. 12. cure, even of the *Scriptures themselves*, or of any *Revealed Religion*, or even of any matter of *Fact* whatsoever that is to be deduced at a distance.

Sett. 9. AND now the same *Reasoning* is applicable also *here* which was made use of concerning the *Eucharist* as a *Mystical Sacrifice*, That, as this *Gospel Priesthood* comes nearer the *Original Priesthood* of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$, and nearer even the first *visible Priesthood* of the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$ as *Incarnate*, by so much the more it must derive of the *influence* of the *Invisible Priesthood*. Whence it will follow that if *Union* with the *Legal Priesthood* was an *Ordinary Means* of procuring an *Union* with the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$, and *Disunion* from that was like also to *disunite* from the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\circ}$, and consequently from the *Father*; then much more these same *Consequences* must likewise follow from the like *Union* or *Disunion* from the *Christian Episcopacy*. The *Consequence* will hold both as to the greater *Certainty* of the *Inference* it self, and as to the greater *moment* of the things so inferred. The *Inference* must be more *certain*, because indeed all the force of this *Reasoning* as applied to the Case of the *Jewish Priesthood* was, in the *Principles* of those persons, intirely due

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 355

due to its being a *Type* of our *Christian* Ch. 12.
Episcopacy, and therefore it must hold
more certainly concerning our *Episcopacy*
itself as the Certainty of all *Premises* is
still greater than that of the *Inferences*
deduced from them. It will also hold
as to the greater *moment* of the things
inferred. For our *Covenant* being esta-
blished on better *Promises*, and more
Explicite Revelations of the *Rewards* and
Punishments of a *future State*; it will fol-
low that the *Rewards* of *Obedience*, and
the *Punishments* of *Disobedience* to
our *Bishops*, and the benefits of *Uni-*
on and the *Mischiefs* of *Disunion* with
them, must be greater than those rela-
ting to the *Jewish High Priesthood*, and
that particularly in regard of the *Soul*,
that being the chief design of *Mysteries*,
and our *future Interests* being those on
which our *Evangelical Covenant* is prin-
cipally grounded, and the ἐρχομένη βασι-
λεία in the μέλλον αἶον being that which
principally concerned our *Saviour* as he
was to be the *Messias* the *Prince*. And
accordingly this greater *Moment* is ex-
pressly owned in the *Reasoning* of the
New Testament, especially by *S. Paul* in
his *Epistle* to the *Ebrians*, as he has al-
ready been observed.

Ch. II. NOR will it now be difficult to
 Sect. 10. understand the reason of those severe
 Expressions in *Tertullian* concerning
Censures passed by the *Bishops* upon *Crim-*
inals. He tells the *Heathens* that the
Christians themselves were certain *De*
 Apol. § 39. *Dei Conspectu*, and that it was *Summum*
futuri Judicii Prejudicium, if any one
 should so offend as to be excluded from
 their *Prayers* and *Assemblies*, and all
Holy Commerce. They might well be
 certain of it, upon the *Hypothesis* now
 described, if the *Ecclesiastical Judicato-*
ries were *Representatives* of that *Cælesti-*
al Judicatory by which all must be judg-
 ed at the last day; if *God* himself, or the
Son to (whom the *Father* has committed
 all *Judgment*) was represented by the
Bishops, and the *Apostles*, (who are then
 to sit on twelve *Thrones* judging the
 twelve *Tribes of Israel*) were repre-
 sented by the *Ecclesiastical Presbyteries*,
 as *Ignatius* says they are; and if the *An-*
gels (who with their *Voice* and *Trum-*
pet were to gather the *Elect* from the
Four Corners of the Earth, plainly allu-
 ding to the Office of the *ie exarchis*,
 who were to call and dismiss *Sacred As-*
semblies with their *Voices* and *Trumpets*)
 were represented by the *Christian Dea-*
 cons;

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 357

cons ; and withal so represented, not as *Ch. 12.*
 one *Person* is represented by another in a
Theater, who is not concerned in the Re-
 presentation, but as a *Client*, is in *Law*,
 represented by his *Proxy*, who is there-
 upon thought obliged himself to ratifie
 whatever is done in his *Person* by such a
Representative ; and if this *Mystical Re-*
presentation was by the appointment of
God himself, as the *Legal Proxies* were
 made by the *Clients* represented by
 them, and the *Mystical Representation*
 was designed, not for an entertainment
 of fancy, but purposely to constitute a
Legal Person, and with a design of con-
 cerning himself consequentially in all the
 flights which may be put upon the *Ec-*
clesiastical Fudicatories, as the nature of
 these *Mystical Representations* were eve-
 ry where understood as *Obligations* to
 the *Gods* themselves to ratifie what was
 done in their name and persons by such
 appointed *Representatives*, and as *Christ*
 himself has expressly promised to resent
 and punish affronts offered to such *Repre-*
sentatives, and to look on them as inter-
 pretatively designed against himself.
 These things being thus understood,
 there was no part of the future *Fudica-*
tory which was not represented in the

Ch. 12. *Ecclesiastical*, and being so, they might be sure that the *future Fudicatory* was obliged by the *Act* of the *Church*, as we are sure every person is obliged by what his *Proxy* acts in his name in *open Court*. He might well call it *Futuri Fudicii Prejudicium*, when, upon these Supposals, the same *Fudicatory* who are to judge all things at the *last day*, must be supposed *already* to have judged such Cases which were decided in the *Ecclesiastical Fudicatories*. God grant our Brethren may lay this seriously to heart.

Sect. II. THESE things therefore being thus solidly laid down by the first *Fathers* in their Disputes against their contemporary *Hereticks* and *SCHISMATICKS*, all the *Inferences* thence deduced against them will follow naturally and undenyably, and withal so evidently, as that the *Inferences* could not be *disowned* by any who owned the *Premises*, and therefore must have been as much the *sense* of the *whole Church* of their *Age* as the *Premises*. It will follow that *Disunion* from the *Bishop* was a *Disunion* from *Christ* and the *Father*, and from all the *Invisible Heavenly Priesthood* and *Sacrifice* and *Intercession*.
It

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 359

It will follow that *Disunion* from any *Ch.* 12. one *Ordinary* must consequently be a *Disunion* from the whole *Catholick Church*, seeing it is impossible for any to continue a *Member* of *Christ's Mystical Body*, who is *disunited* from the *Mystical Head* of it. It will follow that *Visible Disunion* from the *external Sacraments* of the *Bishop* is, in the *Consequence*, a *Disunion* from the *Bishop*, and from the whole *Catholick Church* in *Communion* with him, who ought to ratifie each others *Censures*, under pain of *SC HISM*, if they do not. For this *visible Communion* in *Sacraments* is, proceeding on these *Principles*, the only *Means* and *Title* to that *Communion* which was *invisible*, and whoever received him to *external Communion* who had been thus validly *disunited* from the *invisible Communion* by the act of any one in whose *Power* it was *validly* to do it, must thereby, in effect, *disunite* themselves from that *invisible Communion*, by professing themselves one with him who had been *validly disunited* from it. At least this Act would be, interpretatively, a *Profession* of *Disunion*, which is also in consequence a *Disunion*, seeing none can have this *Union* but by *professing* it. Thus it appears

Ch. 12. how consequently they reasoned in proving such Persons *disunited* in all regards both of *Visible* and *Invisible Communion*.

Sect. 12. THIS therefore being also granted, it thence appears further how consequentially they reasoned in proving them *deprived* also of the *Benefits* of this *Union*. For it was impossible that they should have the *Benefits* of *Union* who wanted the *Union* it self from which those *Benefits* were to result. They deny them to have any *pardon* of their *Sins*. And how could they have it who had no portion in the *Heavenly Sacrifice* which *Christ* as the *Λόγος ἀεχρεός* was supposed to offer in *Heaven*, by which their *Sins* were to be *attoned*? or in his *Intercession* by which his Father's *Displeasure* was to be *appeased*, and which was grounded on that *Sacrifice*? And this they must want who were cut off from the *Mystical Representation* and *Trans-action* of that *Sacrifice* in the *Eucharist*. They denied them a *Portion* in their *own Prayers*. And how could they do otherwise when they thought them to have no *Interest* in the *Prayers* and *Intercession* of *Christ* himself? They could not expect to be heard but in such
Prayers

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 361

Prayers as were *agreeable to his will*. For Ch. 12⁷
indeed the whole *hope* of having their *own Prayers* heard, was, in this way of *S. John*
Reasoning, grounded on this, that their *V. 14*
own Prayers in Earth were *Mystical*
Representations of what the Λόγος was
supposed at the same time to be *Praying*
for in *Heaven*. And therefore such
Prayers as were *disagreeable to his mind*
could lay no *claim* to the *Divine Accep-*
tance, because they could not truly pre-
tend to be such *Representations*. For in-
deed how could the Λόγος be supposed
to be offering *Covenant-Sacrifices* for
them who were no *Members* of that
Covenant which was *maintained* by those
Sacrifices? I mean for the obtaining
those *special favors* which were *promised*
on God's part on *his part* of the *Covenant*.
Such are *pardon of Sins*, the *Holy Ghost*,
Eternal Life, &c. which peculiarly re-
lated to the *Spiritual Kingdom* of the
Λόγος. As for other more general *tem-*
poral Benefits which were not *confined* to
the *Covenant*, the Λόγος was supposed
to pray for *them* for the *whole World* as
being indeed himself the *King* and *Go-*
vernor of it in that general sense. And
accordingly the *Higb Priest* himself is
said to represent the *whole World* in
Philo

Ch. 12. *Philo* by the *Mystical* Signification of his *Vestments*. And so the *Temple*, relating to the *Sacrifices* offered by the *High Priest*, represented also the *Great Temple* of the *World*, as not *he* only, but *Josephus* also, collects from the *Hellenistical* Interpretations of its *Coverings*. And thus the *Christian Eucharistical Sacrifices* were also offered for *all Mankind*, as appears not only from the several remaining *Forms* of the *ancient Liturgies*, but also in the yet more *ancient Offices* which were used in the time of *Tertullian*. And yet even as to this *inferior* sort of *Prayers*, they have undoubtedly a *worse Right*, who, by their *Misdemeanors*, are judged, by their *Superiors*, to have forfeited their *Right* in the *other* sort, than they who *never* had any.

Sect. 13. THEY denied them also the *Holy Ghost*. And this they might also do very solidly and consequently on the received *Doctrines* concerning *Sacrifices*. For if the *Holy Ghost* took the same way to *insinuate* himself by the *Christian Sacrifices* as the *ill Spirit* was supposed to do; then they, who would have him, ought to make use of those *Sacrifices* as the *Ordinary Means* whereby they were to receive him, and they who did not communicate

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 363

communicate in the *Sacrifices* must, for Ch. 12, that Reason, be supposed to have no part in the *Holy Ghost* which was communicated by them. Nor did this Reasoning hold only concerning the *first reception* of him, but proceeded altogether as strongly for the *continuance* of him by the *same means*. For by all the *similitudes*, by which the *Holy Ghost* is expressed in the Scripture, it appears that he is so *given*, as to need a *continuance*, and so to need such a *continuance* as that he must immediately cease to be where that *continuance* is *interrupted*. He is likened to *Springs* of *Water*, and *Water* must immediately fail in the *Rivulet* whenever they are cut off from the *Fountain*. He is likened to a *Light* shining in a dark place, and neither can that continue when it is *broken* from the *Luminary*. Nor is the way of *Reasoning* from *Similitudes* to be rejected in a Subject of this nature, because they are indeed the proper Scripture-Language in such matters, and God has therefore peculiarly *fitted* them to express the *nature* of things so spoken of. As therefore this is implied to be the *nature* of the *Spirit* that it immediately ceases to be where the *Channels* of its conveyance

Ch. 12. conveyance are interrupted ; so its influences are confined to one Body. The external Society of the Church is called the *Mystical Body of Christ*, is called a *Vine*, &c. And the Consequence is allowed in that very particular, that as the *Branches* of a *Vine* can no longer bear fruit than they are incorporated in the *Vine* to which they belong, so neither can *Christians* partake of the common influences of *Christianity* any longer than they continue in the common Body of *Christians*. And the *Holy Spirit* is called the *Bond* of this *Unity*, because, as he makes them all one whom he inspires, so neither does he inspire any but such as own and belong to that *Unity*. Therefore it is that *Unity* is so recommended as a Qualification for receiving these Influences of the uniting Spirit. Our disagreeing hinders our Prayers. Therefore married Persons are obliged to avoid mutual Provocations, that their Prayers might not be hindered. If they do pray in this condition, yet such Prayers have no Promise nor Encouragement that they shall find acceptance. Christ's Promise of hearing even two or three when gathered in his name is only on condition that they agree in the things they desire from

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 365

from him. Otherwise they are not ca- Ch. 12.
pable of the *Intercession* of the *Spirit* of
Prayer and *Supplication*. And if this
hold, even in *private Animosities* when
obstinately persevered in, much more
in Case of *Division* from the *Church*.
If *Animosities*, as they are *tendencies* to
Division, hinder the *Influences* of the
Spirit, it will but be proportionable Rea-
soning, that *actual Division* from the
Body should cut off all *Title* to the *Influ-*
ences of the *Spirit*.

A N D as this holds in *other Prayers*, Sect. 14.
so particularly in this *sort* of *Prayer*
which is joyned with *Sacrifice*. Our
Saviour does sufficiently imply that
even *Sacrifices* themselves are not ac-
ceptable without *Unity*. We are to
leave our *Gift at the Altar* in Case of
any *Animosity*, and first to be reconciled
to him before we have any encourage-
ment to offer it with any hopes of accep-
tance. This comes exactly home to the
Case of the *Lord's Supper*, as our *Chri-*
stian Eucharistical Sacrifice, That this is
absolutely necessary to keep us *actually*
joyned to that *Unity*, which is a quali-
fication without which it is as impossible
for us to have the *Spirit*, as it is impos-
sible that any *Branch* of a *Tree* can enjoy
the

Ch. 12. the *Vegetative Life* if divided from the *Trunk*, or that any *Member* of our *natural Bodies* can partake in the *Animal Life* when separated from our *Bodies*, or that any *Light* should remain either in the *Object* or the *Air* when cut off from the *Luminary* from whence it proceeds. I do not mean that none can have the *Spirit*, or be *actually united*, any longer than he *actually communicates*, nor did any think so concerning the *Popular Sacrifices*. The *Unity* was always supposed to continue as long as the *Right*, that the *person might* communicate and be *admitted* if he pleased. But then the question concerning this *Right* was to be decided, like other questions of the like nature, by the *sentence* of the *competent Judge*. In other Cases of *Right* relating to *Possessions*, the *sentence* of a *competent Judge* proceeding on the Rules and Evidences which are allowed by *Law*) tho after all it be fallible with how much integrity soever it be pronounced) is notwithstanding thought sufficient, even in *Equity* and *Justice*, to cut off all contrary Pleas of *Right* in opposition to it; and every one would be sensible that the opposing *unaccountable* Pleas of *Right* to the satisfaction of the *competent Judges*,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 367

Judges, would make Controversies end- *Ch. 12.*
less, and *dissolve* the whole *Societies*
where such *Pleas* should be *admitted*.
And our Brethren will never be able to
explain why the same *Reason* should not
hold concerning the Decision of *Spiritu-*
al Rights as well as *Temporals*, if God
himself have been pleased to erect a
Spiritual Fudicatory, tho that be also
acknowledged *fallible*. Thus it appears
how *prudent* and *solid*, and how little
fancyful, the *Reasoning* is from these
similitudes, as applyed by *S. Cyprian*.
Nor does this hinder but that God may
consider the mollifying *Circumstances*
which are allowable in the Cases of
such persons as have indeed no claim to
Legal Right. But it is for the just *Inter-*
est of *Government* in *general*, that the
Decision of *Legal Rights* do peremptori-
ly depend on the *Sentence* of *competent*
Judges; and that recourse to extraordi-
nary *Trials* be rarely and very *difficult-*
ly admitted, so as that still the *Generality*
of *Mankind* be obliged to depend on
such *ordinary Decisions*, for the satis-
faction of their own *Consciences* concern-
ing even such *Rights* themselves.

CHAP.

C H A P. XIII.

*The forementioned Reasoning applied
to the present Case of our Modern*
SCHISMATICKS.

The CONTENTS.

*The Applicableness of this same Reason-
ing to the Case of our Modern SCHIS-
MATICKS. Gospel-Constitutions
designed Perpetual. Sect. I. Unity de-
signed perpetual. Sect. II. Even
that of this Life. Sect. III. Christ
designed and instituted Means suf-
ficient for perpetuating this External
Unity. The same Means of erecting
the Church into a Body-Politick as
conducive to the perpetuating an Ex-
ternal Unity Now (as Then) and
for Ever. Sect. IV. The Means of
confining the Benefits of the Covenant
to the Solemnities of it by Sacrifice as
conducive to the same purpose of erect-
ing a Body Politick now also, and for
Ever. Sect. V. Our Christian Sacri-
fice of the Eucharist is of a perpetual
Use.*

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 369

Use. Sect. VI. *And perpetually useful Ch. 13^a*
for the same purposes as in the Apo-
stles Time. Sect. VII. And therefore
perpetually useful in order to the par-
taking in the Invisible Heavenly Sacri-
fice. Sect. VIII. No communica-
ting with the Father and the Son but
by Communion with the Bishop. Sect.
IX. This same Reasoning, if it was
good in S. Cyprian's time, is still as
good as it was then, and will be so for
ever. Sect. X. These Symbolical Re-
presentations are not otherwise to be in-
terpreted Now than they were in the
Primitive Times. Sect. XI. Our Ad-
versaries, in their separate condition,
can lay no claim to the One Altar. Sect.
XII. Nor to the One Priesthood.
Sect. XIII. The sad condition of
SCHISMATICKS. *Sect. XIV.*
How little Friends they are to Souls
who are for prejudging persons against
our Reasons by Popular Arts of raising
Odium against our Cause, or our Per-
sons. Sect. XV. XVI.

AND if this Reasoning was good *Sect. 1.*
 and solid as thus applyed by the
Ancient Christians to the Case of their
 B b *contemporary*

Ch. 13. *contemporary SCHISMATICKS*,
 what can our Adversaries pretend why
 it should not be as good and solid *still*?
 Is it possible that the *nature* of things
 can be changed? Can *Truth* cease to be
Truth, or *SCHISM* to be *SCHISM*?
 Can *SCHISM* become *less Criminal* in
 our *Age* than it was *formerly*? Or have
 they any assurance of being more *indul-*
gently dealt with, if they should prove
equally criminal? These things, alas!
 to say no more, are too ticklish for them
 to venture their immortal *Souls* on, and
 I doubt not but the more considerable
 among them will not so much as *pretend*
 them. What is it then that may be
 trusted that they *can* pretend? Is it that
 tho the *nature* of *SCHISM* be *eternally*
 and *equally* criminal, yet it may change
 in its *imputation*, that the matter of *Fact*
 may be chargeable with *SCHISM* in
 one *Age*, as the *Samaritans* were guilty
 of *SCHISM* for separating from the
Jewish High Priest, which yet the *Apo-*
stles were not, tho they were likewise
 chargeable with the same *Separation*?
 But does it follow that because such
 Changes were allowable from the *Posi-*
tive Institutions of *Moses*, therefore the
 like Change is also now allowable under
 the

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 371

the Gospel? And have I not proved that *Ch. 13.*
the *ancient Christians* used this same *Reasoning*, and used it *solidly*, even under the Gospel! That the *Law* had any *Temporary Constitutions* they concluded from the *Pradictions* of the *Law* it self which foretold a *Change* in the *later times*. But can they pretend the like *Change* under the Gospel? Does the Gospel foretel any further *later Days* wherein its *own Constitutions* shall be antiquated also? Nay, do not the same persons stile the Gospel the *Everlasting Gospel*, in opposition to the *Temporarieness* of many of those *Legal Constitutions*? Why so, if its *Constitutions* were also *Temporary*?

BUT tho I should not take this *general Advantage* from the designed *Perpetuity* of the *Gospel Constitutions*, what is there that our Brethren can pretend to be *Temporary* to excuse themselves, in the *particulars* of our present Dispute, tho we had no other direction to judge by than the *nature* of the *Things* themselves? Can they think *Unity* it self a *Temporary* thing, especially that *Unity* which is *invisible*? This I am confident they will not *pretend*; and if they should, I am yet more confident they could not

Sect. 2.

B b 2 produce

Ch. 13. produce any plausible ground of such pretence from any Words or Principles of the *New Testament*. As the *Mystical Evange* was thought to be the proper Office of the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ in the *Hellenistical Philosophy*, so the main design of our Saviour's coming is as plainly said in the *New Testament* to be that he might make all one. And can they think that *Temporary* which is the main Office of our Saviour as the $\Delta\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$, and the main design of his *Incarnation*, and which is then likely to be most perfect when all *Temporary Things* are antiquated in *Heaven*?

Sett. 3. But is *Unity* in this *World* at least a *Temporary Design*? Was it not one of the $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\iota\lambda\iota\alpha$ sung by the *Angels* at his *Birth*, that he was to bring *Peace* on *Earth*? Was this *Blessing* designed only for a while? He is the *Prince of Peace*, and his *Kingdom* may as well be made *Temporary* as his *Designs of Peace*. The *Prophecies* concerning his *Kingdom* are, that it should bring abundance of *Peace* so long as the *Sun* and *Moon* endureth. And can this be any other than a *secular Peace* that was here spoken of? And indeed if we will keep consonant to *Principles*, there could be no *Office* more suitable

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 373

suitable to the Λόγος *incarnate* than to Ch. 13.
 transact that *visibly* on *Earth* which he
 is supposed to perform *invisibly* in *Hea-*
ven. This was it alone which, on the
 Principles already described, could make
 his proceedings on *Earth* available.
 The *Power* of them must be derived from
 their being true *Representations* of the
invisible Transactions in *Heaven*. This
 will make his *Sacrifice* on the *Cross* a true
Sacrifice, if it represented the *Invisible*
Heavenly Sacrifice offered by the Λόγος.
 This will make the Man *Jesus* a true
Priest, if he personated the *Lord from*
Heaven. And this would argue him
 indeed to be the Λόγος *Incar-*
nate, if all he did on *Earth* was in correspon-
 dence with the *same designs* which the
 Λόγος was driving on in *Heaven*. And
 if so, then (as the Λόγος in *Heaven*
 was driving on Designs of *Invisible Uni-*
ty) a *Visible Unity* must also have
 been the principal Design of the *Incar-*
nate Λόγος as *visible*. And as the *Unity*
 designed in *Heaven* was *perpetual*, and
 designed that it should be so; so also the
Visible External Unity aimed at by our
Saviour on *Earth* could have been no
 other than a *Perpetual* one, as it was de-
 signed by him.

Ch. 13. WELL then. If this *Unity* thus
Sect. 4. *designed* was both an *external* and a *perpetual* Peace, where can they yet suspect whether themselves be unconcerned in the *Consequence* of those Discourses against those ancient *Violaters* of this *external peace* of the *Christian Church*? Can they think that *Christ* made no *Provision* for the *Preservation* of this *External Peace* so *designed* by him? Or can they think that his *Provisions* were *designed* but *Temporary* for an *End* which he *designed* should be *perpetual*? They cannot have so mean thoughts of the *Prudence* of our *Blessed Lord*. Or if they should, these very *Discourses* of those *earliest Christians* are sufficient to convince them, whose very *Age* must qualify them for *knowing* what *Provision* was *actually* made. And not to urge them again too closely with the *Prudence* of our *Saviour's Institution*, what is there that they can think *temporary* in that whole *Constitution* on which those *Ancient Christians* did proceed? I may now confidently take it for granted, that the *Constitution* so alluded to was indeed *suitable* to the *Circumstances* of those *Ages*, because I have already proved the *Prudence* and *Solidity* of their *Reasonings* upon
upon

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 375

upon it. What is therefore in that *Ch. 13.*

whole *Scheme* that for the same *Reason* that made it seasonable *then*, will not be seasonable *still*, and for ever? Was it *then* thought expedient in order to the *preservation* of this *External Unity* to confederate them into a *Body Politick*? And is not such a *Constitution* as naturally conducive *still* to the maintenance of an external Unity, as it was *then*, and will it not be so for ever? Will not all their little *Latitudinarian* Objections proceed as effectually against the *Prudence* and *Justice* and *Expedience* for *Unity* of such a *Provision* in the *Primitive Church* as they do *now* against the same in *ours*? Can they in earnest think that the same *Principles* they insist on for justifying their present contempt of the *Ecclesiastical Government* and their present *Separation*, would not have obliged themselves to *separate*, if they had lived in those *times*, or would not have excused and justified those who did then *separate*? I speak not of the particular *Laws* and *Constitutions* which are changeable with the change of *Circumstances*, but of the *Obligation* of the *Government* it self, and the *Legislative Power* which, of their own nature, are coeternal with

Ch. 13. the *Societies* to which they belong respectively. And it is too great an Argument of their consciousness of *Guilt* in this particular, that they are so forward to undertake the *Patronage* of those *Ancient SCHISMATICKS*. Their late *Church Historian* is very kind to the *Memory* of the *Novatians* and *Donatists*. Why so, but that he seems sensible that his own *Principles* would have made him do as they did, if he had lived in those *Circumstances*? On the contrary, there is nothing in those *Reasonings* which obliged persons to *Submission* to *Government* of the *Church*, in those *ancient times*, which will not do so still, and for ever; and we have no reason to believe but that they, who, upon those *Reasons* thought themselves obliged to *Submission* to their *Ecclesiastical Governors*, under pain of *SCHISM*, then, would, for the same *Reasons*, have thought themselves obliged to it now, under the same pain of *SCHISM*, if they had refused it.

Sect. 5. AS therefore an external *Government* is still as naturally conducive as ever for the preservation of *External Unity*; so also the *Means* then used are still as efficacious both for erecting a *Society*, and supporting the *Government* of it when once

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 377

once erected, and fitting it to the end of Ch. 13. maintaining a *Mystical Unity*. The *Means* we have seen then designed was the confining the *Benefits* of the *Covenant* to the *Solemnities* of the *Covenant*, and transacting the *Solemnities* by *Sacrifice*, and confining the *Power* of *Sacrificing* to a certain *Order* of *Persons*; so that none could partake of those *Sacrifices* but from them, and obliging every *Individual* to the *Publick Panegyres*, that none might think himself secure without a participation in those *Sacrifices*, and extending those *Panegyres* to whole *Cities*, and confining the management of those *Panegyres* to a single *Person*. Now what is there in all this that our Brethren can think temporary, or not as conducive as ever to the obliging all to a dependence on a *City-Monarch*? Is it not still as reasonable as ever, that the *Benefits* for which the *Stipulation* is made, should be confined to those who are interested in the *Covenant*? If not, what *Obligation* will remain for any to enter into the *Covenant*, if they may enjoy the *Benefits* without it? Or is it not still as reasonable to confine the *Covenant* to the *Solemnities* of it, that the *Obligation* may be solid in form of *Law*, and that there may

Ch. 13. may be a *notorious* way of distinguishing *truly* interess'd persons from *false* pretenders? And is not this *distinction* as necessary as *ever* for the *External Administration* of things, and the *preservation* of an *external Unity*?

Seet. 6. IF this be so, what can be said to the way of maintaining this *external Unity*, of transacting these *external Solemnities* of the *Covenant* by the *Blessed Sacrament*? What can they say why this should not be a way as *seasonable* to the *Circumstances* of the *present Age* as it was in those of the *Primitive Christians*? Is not the *Sacrament* it self of a *perpetual Use*, and as *seasonable now* as *formerly*? If it be (as I think none of our *Adversaries* will deny, except the *Socinians* and our lately *Socinianiz'd Enthusiasts*) does it not perform the same *Office* as it did *then*? This is indeed the only thing that can *make* it (in this way of Reasoning from the Reason of the thing it self) *perpetual*, that the same *Ends* are *perpetual*, and that no other *Means* but this are *appointed*, or are ever to be *expected* for the *future*, for the *attaining* of those *Ends*. And undoubtedly, in the way of Reasoning on which the *Primitive Christians* took up the *Use* of this *Sacrament*,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 379

ment, they could not chuse but think, *Ch. 13.* that it *must* be perpetual. For so I have shewn that, in their *Mystical Reasonings* from the *Old Testament*, as they took the *New Testament* Institutions to be *Arche-typal* to those of the *Old*, so in allusion to the *Platonick* Notions then received that made all *Archetypal Beings* eternal, they use the same form of speaking concerning the *Gospel* it self, and concerning all its *Institutions* that were taken up as typified in the *Law*. And if the *Eucharist* were taken up as typified by the *Bread of Melchizedec*, then it must by the consequence of that particular way of *Reasoning*, be an *Everlasting Sacrifice*, because it answered an *Everlasting Priesthood*, that of *Christ*, in opposition to the *Levitical Priesthood*, as typified in the *Priesthood of Melchizedeck*. But yet there is no need, in this matter, to insist much on *Notions* so little observed. Those which are commonly received are sufficient to my purpose. The *Sacraments* cannot be antiquated on that general account, which is commonly taken for granted, of antiquating the whole *Old Testament*, because indeed neither of them, tho taken up as some conceive in imitation of some unwritten *Traditionary Observances*,

Ch. 13. Observances, were yet grounded on any *express Old Testament Institution*. If therefore they will otherwise, by *Reasoning*, prove them *antiquated*, they must either prove them such *discretionary* things as are included in the *general* power of those who are by God appointed to *judge of Circumstances*, or they must prove it from the *New Testament* by the same way of Reasoning by which the *Primitive Christians* undertook to prove the *antiquating* of those Rites of *Judaism* discontinued by themselves from the very *design* of the *Old Testament*. The former way they can hardly venture on, if they would be pleased particularly to consider the nature and design of the *Eucharist*. If they consider it as a *Mystery*, that is, as a *Representation* of the *Heavenly Eucharist*, or of what is there transacted by the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ in his own *Person*, so none but the $\Lambda\omicron\gamma\textcircled{\text{C}}$ himself is *competent* for determining any thing concerning it, because none but he can *know* the *Original Mystery* to which these *Copies* are to *correspond*; and without knowing that, it is impossible to know *when* it does *indeed* correspond, and when it *ceases* to do so, especially for any *Creature* to do so without

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 381

out *Actual Revelation*, which is not Ch. 13. here pretended without the *Scriptures*. If they consider it as the *Great Seal* of *Heaven*, so tho it be communicable to such *Subjects* whose *Office* it is to use it, yet either *totally* to lay it by, or to frame a *New Broad Seal* without *express Authority* from the *Prince* whose *Seal* it is, is counted *Treason* even in those very *Subjects* who are otherwise *entrusted* with the *Power* of *administring* it. But considering it further as a *Bond* of *Union*, so there can be less *pretence* to this *Power* of *antiquating* it in any *Office* that is purely *Ecclesiastical*. For this *Union* of the *Multitude* of *Believers* as grounded on the *external Administration* of these *Symbols*, as *confined* to a certain *Order* of *Men* is, in *Truth*, the *Foundation* of *Ecclesiastical Authority* in those *Persons* who are *entrusted* with the *Power* of *administring* them. Because it is by this means put in their *Power* to *admit* to, or *exclude* from, this *Society*, therefore it also consequently follows that it must be also in their *Power* to *impose* what *Terms* they please of such *Admission*. And therefore there being no *human Authority* imaginable but what is thus *built* on it, the *Authority* thus *consequent*

b. 13. *quent* to it, cannot extend to what is *an-*
tecedent to it self, cannot *subvert* its own
Foundations.

Sett. 7. I T remains therefore that they *prove*
 them *antiquated* from the *design* of the
 New Testament it self. But yet nei-
 ther will they, I believe, *pretend* to this
 when they thoroughly consider it. For
 will they, *can* they, think that there is
 any *future Dispensation* to be expected to
 succeed the *Gospel*, and to which the
Gospel must give way; or that any such
 Dispensation is in the least *foretold* by
 the *Gospel* it self, as the *Primitive Chri-*
stians proved that the *Gospel* was predict-
 ed by the *Law* it self, as that by which it
 should in course be *antiquated* and *abolish-*
ed? Can they shew that the *Institutions*
 of the *Gospel* are *Shadows* and *Resem-*
blances of the *Institutions* of any such
future Dispensation, that so they may,
 in reason, be obliged to *yield* to the *Sub-*
stance represented by them when that
 shall appear, as the *Christians* proved
 this true concerning the *Legal Ceremonies*
 from the *Letter* of the *Law* it self? Can
 they prove in particular that there is, or
 ever shall be, any *nearer Draught* of that
Archetypal Visible Sacrifice of our Saviour
 upon the *Cross* than this of the *Eucharist*,

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 383

as the *Primitive Christians* did prove that *Ch. 13.*
their *Eucharist* was a nearer draught of
that same *Sacrifice* on the *Cross* than the
Sacrifices of the *Mosaick Law*? When they
can prove any of these things, they will
indeed say something. But if they can
prove none of them, how can they pre-
tend to prove the *antiquating* of this Sa-
crament? How much less can they pre-
tend to do it by any *Parity* of *Reasoning*
with those of the *Primitive Christians*?
Thus it appears how little reason we
have, even at *present*, to depend on any
Courtesie of our *Adversaries* in this par-
ticular.

IF therefore the Blessed Sacrament *Sect. 8.*
be of a *perpetual use* and *perpetually useful*,
for the *same designs* as formerly; it will
then follow that it must be a *Symbol* of
Unity. And then it must still be under-
stood not only as a *Ceremony* of *Admission*
into the *Society* of the *Church*, but as a
Title to the *Privileges* of the *Society* into
which men are so admitted. By parta-
king of this *visible Sacrifice* they must be
intituled to an *Interest* in the *Invisible Sa-*
cristice of the *Logos* in *Heaven*, and by
consequence to all the *Benefits* obtained,
and all the *Evils* expiated in that *Sacri-*
fice. And on the contrary *Exclusion*
from

Ch. 13. from it must be a *Forfeiture* of all the *Benefits* so obtained, and an *exposing* of the Person *defenceless* to all those *Evils* of which that *Heavenly Sacrifice* is an *Expiation*. And if it still must have the same *efficacy* it ever has had in its *Mystical Capacity*, it must not only *unite* or *disunite* to the *Sacrifice*, but to all the *Company* which have here a *Right* of *Communicating*, and not only to the *Visible Company*, but to those *Invisible Societies* in *Heaven* represented by those in *Earth*. By this Reasoning the *partaking* of this *visible Sacrifice* will *unite* us to all that do, or may, partake with *us* in it here on *Earth*, that is, to the whole *Visible Church* by an *Act* of *External Communion*, because all who are by the *Governors* of any *Communion* taken to belong to the *Catholick Church*, in what part soever of the *World*, are for that reason granted to have a *Right* to their *own Communion*, if they had been *present*, and *desired* it. And by the same *Mystical Reasoning* it must also *unite* us to the *Invisible Society* of *Saints* and *Angels* in *Heaven*, not only as these are also confessed to make up that *Mystical Body* of which *Christ* is the *Head*, who is the *Head* of *Angels* and *Principalities* and

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 385

and Powers and of every Creature, but Ch. 13.
also as they make up the *Invisible Church*
communicating in the *Invisible Archety-
pal Sacrifice* in Heaven. For as, in this
Mystical way of Interpretation our com-
municating at the *Visible Altar* which
represents the *Invisible Altar* is account-
ed a *Communion* with the *Invisible Altar*
so represented by it; so by the same Rule
of Interpretation our Communicating
with the *Visible Assistants* at this *Visible*
Altar must be accounted a communicating
with those *Invisible Communicants* in
Heaven, who are also represented by our
Visible Communicants on Earth. Besides
the same thing will also follow from the
other Supposition, that our communica-
ting with the *Visible Altar* is accounted
as a communicating with that which is *In-
visible*. For if, by this means, we and
they are accounted as *Communicants* at
the same *Invisible Altar*, we must, on
that account, be the same way made
One with them in Heaven, as all who com-
municate at the same *Visible Altar* are
made One on Earth.

BUT S. Fohn makes communicating Sect. 9.
with the Church to be a communicating
with the Father and the Son. But this
particular cannot be understood, in this

C c

Mystical

Ch. 13. *Mystical Way of understanding things, so conveniently of any thing as of Communion with the Bishop. I have shewn how, in the Mysteries, the Hierophanta was to personate the God who was concerned in those Mysteries, and that it was, on account of this Personation, that he who communicated with the Hierophanta, was accounted to communicate with the Deity represented by him. I have shewn that the Bishop alone answered the Hierophanta as the Supreme of all those Officers that were concerned in the Mysteries; nay, that he answered him in this very particular of personating the Father and the Son, as the Comparisons were then made by those earliest Christians. If therefore Communion with the Archetype was to be maintained by Communion with the Ectypal Representative; then Communion with the Bishop must be the only Means of maintaining a Communion with the Father and the Son, because he only represents them. And that he only could represent them as Principles of Unity appears from the Foundation of this Unity, because it is grounded on Headship. Christ is a Principle of Unity to Mankind, because he is the Head of the Man, and*
God

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 387

God is a *Principle of Unity* even to *Christ* Ch. 13. himself because he is the *Head of Christ*. And because none that has Interest in the *visible Government* of the *Church* can represent *God and Christ* in this particular regard of *Headship* but the *Bishop*, therefore none but *he* can represent them as *Principles of Unity*. And therefore in this *Mystical Way of Reasoning* from *Representations to Things*, none but the *Bishop* can unite us to the *Father* and the *Son*. Whence it will further follow that whoever are *disunited* from the *Visible Communion* of the *Church on Earth*, and particularly from that *Visible Communion* of the *Bishop*, must consequently be *disunited* from the whole *visible Catholick Church on Earth*, and not only so, but from the *Invisible Communion* of the *Holy Angels and Saints in Heaven*, and which is yet more from *Christ and God himself*, and all the *Benefits* consequent to all these *Unities*, whether *Visible* or *Invisible*, which cannot in reason be thought *communicable* to him who is *disunited* from the *Original* from whence they flow.

THIS was good Reasoning in *S. Sect. 10.* *Cyprian's* time. And what can our *Adversaries* pretend why it should not

Ch. 13. still be allowed for good Reasoning *now* and for *ever*? Were these Instituted *Representations* understood *then* as *Covenants* on *God's* part obliging him to ratify the things so *Represented* by his own Appointment, and were they understood so by the most *solid* ways of *judging* that those *Ages* were capable of; and can they yet think it possible that those very *Ancients*, to whose Capacities these Institutions were originally *fitted*, could be *mistaken* concerning *God's* mind when they used the most likely means for finding it that they were capable of? Or if they cannot deny but it was *solid* then, what can they say why it should not be so *still*? Is not the *Bishop* as apt as ever to *signifie* a *Principle* of *Unity*, and to *represent* *God* and *Christ* under the Notion of a *Head*? Nay, does not his *Monarchical Presidency* over his Brethren of the *Clergy* peculiarly *fit* him for such a *Signification*? And does he not the more naturally *represent* *God* and *Christ* in the Notion of a *Head* by how much he is more like in their *Monarchy*, I mean over that particular *Body* over which *Bishops* were at first placed by *Divine Institution*? Or do they think them *less* of *Divine Institution* *now* than *formerly*?

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 389

formerly? This would indeed weaken *Ch. 13.* the *Obligation* on *God's* part. For even in the use of *Covenanting Symbols* none is *obliged* by them but he that *uses* them, and therefore neither would *God* be *obliged* to ratifie what is here *represented* in his name, if the *Representation* had not been of his own *Appointment*. He would not then be obliged to make them partakers of the *Invisible Unity* who are *united* to the *Bishop*, nor to exclude them from that *same Invisible Unity*, who are *disunited* from him. But what can be requisite for deriving this appointment at a *distance* but an *uninterrupted Succession* from them who had it *immediately*? What more had those earlier Ages themselves to pretend for it? What more can our Adversaries themselves pretend, at least, what more can they rationally account for, without *Enthusiastick Pretences* to new *Revelation*? And do not our *Bishops* plead the same *Argument* of *Succession*? Nor is it any matter in *Law* for weakening the *Claim*, at what distance this *Succession* be deduced, so that it be still deduced through unquestionable hands. No matter how long the *Chain* be, so the *Links* be entire and equal to the burden supported by it.

Ch. 13. IF those *Symbolical Representations*
 Sect. 11. were of *Divine Institution*, and were
 withal to be *interpreted* according to the
way of Interpretation of that *Age*, I can-
 not see how they can avoid but that God
 will be obliged to ratifie a *Union* or *Dis-*
union with the *Bishop on Earth* by the
 like *Union* or *Disunion* in *Heaven*. Will
 they therefore to avoid it, say, that we
 are not now to follow that *way of Inter-*
pretation in expounding it, particularly
 that we are not now to regard what were
 the received *Notions* concerning *Myste-*
ries in those *Ages*, nor what *Interpreta-*
tions were inevitably consequent from
 these *Notions*, and must therefore have
 been infallibly thought *just* and *solid*
 with them among whom these *Notions*
 were so *received*, but that God intended
 the *Scriptures* intelligible in *all Ages*,
 and therefore could not make the true
sense of such *Scriptures* to depend on *No-*
tions antiquated so long ago, and so
 little observed and known in our *Modern*
Ages, this may indeed seem more *plau-*
sible at the first prospect, than it will be
 found solid on a thorough and impartial
Examination. For can they indeed
 think that all those several and *contra-*
dictory senses which may easily be raised
 of

of the several *Terms* and *Expressions* Ch. 13.
 from the *Usages* of *different times* both of
Words and *Things* and *Notions* to which
 those *Words* have relation, could ever
 have been *designed* by *God*? Could they
 think that the *Sacred Writers* themselves
 could possibly *mean* them in senses *un-*
known to *them*, and with *Relation* to
Things and *Notions* not as yet in *being*?
 Was not *Providence*, at least, as *much*
 concerned for *Them* as for *Us*? And was
 it not as necessary that *they* should under-
 stand those *Writings* which were prima-
 rily designed for *their Use* as that *we*
 should understand them? And was it
 not as harsh that *they* should be remitted
 to *Senses* and *Notions* not yet existent, as
 that *we* should be obliged, in order to the
 same design of understanding them, to
 have recourse to those *Senses* and *Noti-*
ons then *used* and notoriously *alluded* to,
 however since discontinued and anti-
 quated in the many *Changes* and *Revo-*
lutions that were in course to be expect-
 ed in such a distance? If so great a *Va-*
riety of *Senses* be allowed of as may be
 gathered from the *same Letter* under-
 stood according to the *Sentiments* of dif-
 ferent *Ages*, it cannot be avoided but
 that every *new Age*, may, under pre-

Ch. 13. tence of *New Expositions*, introduce a whole new *Scheme* of *Christian Doctrines*. If, to avoid this, all must be confined to one certain *Sense* and way of expounding the *Scriptures*; there can be nothing thought on more convenient than that this one *Sense* be that *Sense* in which it was understood by the *Primitive Christians* to whose Capacities it was peculiarly fitted by the *Holy Ghost*, and the way of expounding the *Scriptures* be the very same which *was*, and *must* have been, made use of by the *Inspired Writers* themselves in expounding their own *Prophecies* which were not expounded to them by a *Second Revelation*. Our Brethren themselves will easily grant that the Scripture was *always clear* in matters *necessary* to *Salvation*. And certainly all *Duties*, and *Duties* of so great importance as these of preserving *Peace* and *Government*, and so *universal Use* in all *Ages* of the *Church*, must be *necessary*, if any thing. And therefore those *Senses* of the *Scriptures* relating to such matters must have been *clear* to *them then*, however they may seem to our *Brethren now*, either because the *Monuments*, to which they then notoriously alluded, are *lost*, or because our *Brethren* take the wrong way

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 393

way to understand them, whilst they *Ch. 13.*
neglect a prudent recourse to those remaining *Monuments* by which they might have been *informed*.

THUS impossible it is for our Ad- *Sect. 12.*
versaries to prove their *Title* to the
One Priesthood and *One Altar*, if the
same Scriptures be still to be expounded
the same way as formerly in matters of
Duty which still *remain*, and are like to do
so for ever, the same as formerly. And as
impossible it will be to make good any
challenge of *Benefit* from *Sacraments* so
administred in their *separate* Condition,
whether we consider their *Altar*, or
their *Priesthood*. If we consider their
Altar. They cannot pretend to repre-
sent the *Invisible Altar* in *Heaven*, at
least not so to represent it as *Legal Sym-*
bols which may infer a *Legal Obligati-*
on. We see the way of making the
Jewish Altar such a resemblance was
first, by fashioning it after the *Archety-*
pal Altar in *Heaven* revealed by God
himself to *Moses* in the *Mount*. Then
by framing all other *Sensible Altars* after
the *resemblance* of that which was first
Copied from the *Heavenly Original*.
What was the meaning of this but to
oblige all other *Altars* to as strict a de-
pendence

Ch. 13. pence on the first *Archetypal* of *Sensibles* as that had on the *Heavenly Archetype* it self. But this our *separating Brethren* cannot pretend to. Their *Sacrifices* do not so much as *unite* them to one another, according to the *Latitudinarians*. Much less do they *unite* them to that *Archetypal Sensible Altar* of the *Bishop*, with which they were at first *united*, and from which they have *since departed*. How can they then pretend to *represent* and *apply* the *Sacrifice* of the *Heavenly Altar*, when withal they do not so much as pretend to any new *Revelation* like that to *Moses*, by which they might *Copy* it immediately from the *Heavenly Archetype*? What portion then can they pretend to in the *Heavenly Altar* and *Sacrifice* which are only designed for an *United People* on *Earth*, and *united* in a *Visible Altar* and *Sacrifice*, and *united* with the *first* of those that are *Visible*? How can they hope such *Altars* can *apply* the *Benefits* of the *Heavenly Altar* when they cannot so much as pretend to *represent* it, being neither *Copied* from it, nor from any others that were so? How can they be taken for *Sealing Representations* that may *oblige* God to *convey* those *Benefits*,
when

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 395

when they are neither appointed by *Ch. 13.* him *immediately*, nor by any *Succession* of *Men* impowered to act in his *Name*?

AND as little Comfort can they *Sett. 13.* hope for from their *Priesthood* in the State of *Separation*, on this very account that it is not an *One Priesthood*. I do not only mean that it is not the *One Priesthood* which alone had the lawful *Original* Right to that Title of the *One Priesthood*. None of our Adversaries have any that can so much as *pretend*, however injuriously, to such a Title as was requisite on this occasion. I have shewn that the *One Priest* was not to answer the *Jewish Ordinary Priests*, whom none ever pretended to be *Principles* of *Unity*, nor was it ever disputed with the *Samaritans* whether there ought to be any more than *one* of such, nor could any such pretend to be a *Head* to his *Brethren*, which, as has been shewn, was the only way of making them fit *Representatives* of *God* and *Christ* as the *Principles* of the *Mystical Unity*. The *High Priest* was he alone who could challenge these things to himself, and when all were agreed that he ought to be only *One*. And therefore our Brethren

Ch. 13. thren ought to shew some *single person* answerable to him, if they will, by these Principles so much as *pretend* to any *Principle of Unity*. This none of our Modern Sects, except the *Presbyterians*, can so much as *offer* at. None of them have any *single Minister*, who, by their Principles, can *pretend* to *Superiority* over his *Brethren*. And all that they can pretend is a *Moderator* over their *Classes*, either for a certain time, or, at the utmost for Term of *Life*. Yet even that is not sufficient for a *Principle of Unity*. Seeing the *Sacrifices* are they which are the Cement of this *Unity*, it must be a *Presidency*, not in their *Assemblies* only, but their *Sacrifices*, which can intitle to a *Principle* of it. But there is no *one person* of their *Classes* that pretends to any Interest more than others in their *Eucharistical Sacrifices*, none to whom the *Union* is principally *designed* that is made to them all in common. Hence it will follow, by the tenor of our present Argument, that they can pretend to no *Signification* of *God and Christ*, in their *Sacraments*, as *Principles of Unity*, and consequently to no *Stipulation* in *God's* part, for a share in the *Invisible Celestial Unity*, nor indeed to any of that
Union

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 397

Union, whereby Christians on account of *Ch. 13.* their being so, are supposed *united* to *Christ*, who have no other way of procuring such a *Union* but by their *Sacraments*, so that still they must be supposed as much *disunited* from *Christ*, as the best of those are who have not yet undertaken the Profession of *Christianity*. And then for all the consequential *Benefits* which plainly *suppose* a *Union*, they must needs have as weak and ill grounded a *Title* as they have to the *Unity* it self to which they are *consequential*.

WHAT a sad consideration must *Sect. 14.* this be to any serious hearty lover of *Human Souls*, to think what Multitudes, of those immortal Beings whom the Son of God has been pleased to ransom with his dearest Blood, are notwithstanding so sadly and so deeply concerned in the *consequence* of this Discourse? That still they are *Aliens* from God and *Christ*, and *Strangers* to the *Covenant of Promise*, and the *Commonwealth* of *Israel*. It is one of the most dreadful aggravations of the condition of the *damned* that they are banished from the *Presence* of the *Lord*, and from the *Glory* of his *Power*. The same is their condition also who are *disunited* from *Christ* by being

Ch. 13. being, *disunited* from his *Visible Representative*. Whatever *Enthusiastick Raptures* they may feel, which are oftentimes the effects of an *Enthusiastick Temper* influenced by *false Principles* of a deluded *Conscience*; yet, by these *Principles*, they must certainly be deprived of all those real *Enjoyments* and holy *Relishes* which devout Souls experience even in *this Life* in the *Communion* with their best beloved. They can have no true solid *Comfort* of *Conscience* who stand on these *Terms* with their *Judge*, who is withal the *Lord* of their *Consciences*. None of that *Peace* which *passeth all understanding* who are no *Subjects* of the *Prince of Peace*, no *Members* of his *Kingdom*. No *Visitations* of the *Heavenly Spirit* who are divided from that *Body* of which the *Spirit* is the *Bond* and *Cement*. And, which is the saddest consideration of all, this condition cuts them off from those *future hopes* which are the only supports and alleviations of good men in *this Life* under their severest *Sufferings*. They who are *disunited* from *Christ* here have no *hopes* of recovering a *Union* with him hereafter. It is certain that whatsoever condition they die in they must abide in it to all *Eternity*.
And

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 399

And it is extremely *uncertain*, and, at *Ch. 13.*
least, infinitely *hazardous*, that they can
have any *Right* to the *Invisible Unity*
who have none to the *Visible* by which
it is *conveyed* and *promised* in a *Legal*
Way, that they shall ever share in the
uncovenanted Mercies of God who can
make out no claim to the *Divine Promi-*
ses and *Covenant*. How *disconsolate*
must such a condition seem to every
truly *Gracious Soul*, that it must want
the *Comforts* of *Religion* here, and lose
the *hopes* of enjoying them hereafter?
What *Terms* of *indifferent Impositions*
can it think less tolerable than the being
reduced to such a desperate condition!

AND is it not, in the mean time, *Seet. 15.*
strange that these men should take upon
them to be the great *Zealots* for *Souls*
who use all the endeavours they can to
keep them secure and careless in a state
of so great, and so imminent, a danger?
They will neither let them receive *Con-*
viction, nor so much as fairly to *examine*
that which might possibly convince
them if it were equally examined. In-
stead of answering our Arguments, they
first endeavour to make our *Cause*, and
then our *persons odious*, and then make
use of their little Arts and Popular Ta-
lents

Ch. 13. lents of Declamation to raise the *Passions* of their *Auditors* and *Readers*. And then they must *avoid* our *Persons* and our *Books*, or come to them with minds possessed with *Prejudice*, and incapable not only of *Conviction*, but also of all *equal Information*. What other Art could the *Enemy* of *Souls* use for securing his *Prey*, than to make them *senseless* of their *danger*? And can they notwithstanding insist on this very particular as an *Argument* of their *Love* of *Souls*, which the implacable *Enemy* of *Souls* takes for the greatest *kindness* to his own *Interest*? We can hardly find any one sort of persons against whom more dreadful *Judgments* are denounced in the *Prophetick Writings* of the *Old Testament* than *seducing Prophets*, and hardly any one *Practice* of that sort of *Persons* than this one of *hardening the Wicked* in a state of *Impenitency*, a *speaking peace* where there is no peace, a *strengthening their hands* with flattering *Misrepresentations*, a *sowing cushions* to their *Arms* on which they may *securely* solace themselves in (God knows!) an extremely *unsecure* condition. This the Scripture calls *hunting of Souls*, and making them to *fly*, and *destroying* them. And must we
take

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 401

take them for *Friends of Souls* who are *Ch. 13*
guilty of it? *Human Frailty* and the
Weakness of our *Understandings* may
possibly go far in *excusing* Errors, tho
otherwise of no inconsiderable *conse-*
quence, where the *will* is not ingredient
in the occasion of them. But besides
that the very nature of these things is
such that they must prove proportiona-
bly *momentous* if they should prove at
all *erroneous*; the *Scripture* it self does
every where insist on this as one of the
most aggravating Circumstances of *im-*
putation to the *person*, as that which
must render him most *inexcusable*, and
most *uncapable* of an *Apology*. This is
the *condemnation* that men love *darkness*,
and hate the *light*, when they hate *God's*
Discipline, and refuse to receive *Instructi-*
on, when they put *God* far from them,
and the *evil day*, and refuse the *knowledge*
of his *ways*. When they will not re-
ceive the *Truth* in the *Love* of it, then
God gives them over to *strong delusions*,
to a *reprobate Sense*, and a *seared Consci-*
ence. And as the *New Testament* is in
many places very plain in asserting the
Limitedness of the *Day of Grace*; so
there is hardly any thing more spoken
of as an *ill omen* that more fatally prog-

D d notifies

Ch. 13. notifies its being near an *expiration*, than that men are come to this desperate pass of avoiding or resisting sufficient conviction, of *loving* their *Flatterers*, and being *averse* to *unpleasing Truths*, and *angry* at their *faithful Monitors*. And what can be indeed more *formidable* to truly *conscientious persons*?

Sect. 15. There would be less reason to be *positive* in a Charge of so high a nature, if they would, at least, give our Reasons an equal *bearing*, tho, after all, they should prove mistaken in *judging* concerning them. But they who deny us even *this*, how can they answer it to God, how can they to their own *Consciences*, how can they to the *World* in that dreadful day when all their *Secrets* must be revealed? What will they say for *themselves*, or to clear themselves from the *destruction* of their *Followers* and *Disciples*, when God shall require their *Blood* at their *Hands* who have undertaken to be their *Shepherds*? Can they plead *Ignorance*, when *Evidence* is offered, and *rejected* by them? Can they pretend the Evidence *insufficient* when they have never examined it so far as to be able to say on their own *knowledge*, that it was *insufficient*? Can they say

One Priesthood, and One Altar. 403

say they were not aware of their *Duty Ch. 13.* even of *examining* it? But what greater warning could they expect than the great *moment* of the thing? And what can be, if this be not, *momentous*? Nor is the condition of those who are *misted* much more secure than that of their *Misguiders*. The *following* as well as the *leading blind* do both of them *fall into the ditch*. He that is *not warned* by the *Watchman* is *overtaken* by the *Sword*; and then what *comfort* can it be to him that his *blood* shall be *required* at the *Watchman's hand*? The great *Lover of Souls* who has already done so great things for their good, discover their duty to them in this particular also. He alone can *open* their *Eyes*, and *captivate* their *Wills*, and *subdue* their *Affections* and *worldly Interests*, and whatever other *Prejudices* do sway them, and make them *partial* in these great Affairs of his *Glor*y and their *own Salvation*. Good *Jesus* do it, and give us all to *know* and *follow* and *embrace* the things which belong to our *Peace* before they be hid from our *Eyes*.

F I N I S.

D d 2

I have

I have been advised by a Worthy Friend to translate the Greek Quotations for the benefit of those who do not understand that Tongue. Accordingly I did it in that part which was not yet wrought off when the Advice was given. In that Part which was, himself was pleased to undertake the Drudgery. And they are as follow.

P Ag. 19. Future Age.
P. 39. In honor therefore of him whose will and pleasure it was to call us, it becomes us to be obedient without all Hypocrisie, because he who does otherwise, does not deceive this Visible Bishop, but imposes on him who is Invisible. But in this matter, the dealing is not with Flesh and Blood, but with God who knows the Secrets.

The Interpretation of the Greek.

Ib. Let no man be mistaken. If any Man be not within the Altar, he falls short of the Bread of God.

But let not any Altar, or Temple be in any other City; for God is One, and the Stock of the Hebrews is One.

Pag. 63. Tobit 1.4,5,6. All the Tribe of *Nephthali* my Father fell from the House of *Ferusalem*, which was chosen out of all the Tribes of *Israel*, that all the Tribes should sacrifice there. Now all the Tribes which together revolted, and the House of my Father *Nephthali* sacrificed unto the Heifer *Baal*.

But I alone went often to *Ferusalem* at the Feasts, as it was ordained unto all the people of *Israel* by an everlasting Decree, having the first Fruits and Tenths of Increase, with that which was first shorn.

Pag. 75. A Stranger.

P. 77. Clement. Why was our Father *Abraham* pronounced blessed?

Ibid. Justin. For the true Israelitick Stock and Spiritual, the Stock of *Judah*, *Jacob*, *Isaac* and *Abraham*, commended by God for his faith in Uncircumcision, and blessed, and styled the Father of many Nations, are we, who by this crucified Christ are brought home to

The Interpretation

God, as shall be shewn in the process of our Discourse.

Id. Ibid. Being the Children of *Abraham* on account of the Faith which we have common with him.

Ib. Idem. Which not only our Ancestors according to God, the Prophets and Law-givers do proclaim.

Pag. 90. From the Law, and from the Catalogues of Succession of the High Priests, how every one succeeded his Father in the honor of presiding over the Temple.

Pag. 97. The greatest or supreme God.

Ibid. According to the likeness of that in *Jerusalem*, and with the same measures.

Ibid. *Onias* therefore upon that place built a Temple and an Altar like to that at *Jerusalem*, but lesser and poorer.

Pag. 98. More than is fit.

Pag. 121. According to the number of the Angels of God.

Pag. 128. Watchers.

Pag. 136, 137. Dæmons Governors of Nations and Cities.

Pag. 137. Ministering Spirits.

Ibid. Yeomen of the Guard.

Pag. 146, 147. Initiated Initiations.

Pag.

of the Greek.

Pag. 147. It was not lawful then for Strangers to be initiated.

Pag. 148. Understanding that he that was to be initiated, must first be inrolled as a Freeman of *Athens*, if not by Nature, yet at least by Law, this was that which he avoided, not initiation, esteeming himself a Citizen of the whole World.

Pag. 148. Proclamation. Cryer.

Pag. 148, 149. For all that will may not partake of the Mysteries : but there are some who are forewarned to exclude themselves, as they who have hands not clean from blood, and they that speak Out-landish Tongues.

Pag. 149. An Army of an unknown Tongue.

Pag. 150, 151. The Priests of other Nations are wont to offer up their Prayers and Sacrifices for those of their own Nation only, and for Friends and Fellow-Citizens.

Pag. 158. Offering the Sacrifices appointed by the Laws.

Ibid. There are Laws by which this ought to be done.

Ibid. It is a perpetual and standing Law for those within the Province of *Athens* to worship their Country Gods

The Interpretation

and Heroes in common, pursuant to the Laws of the place.

Ibid. I will truly observe the Religious Rites of my Country.

Pag. 159. Sacrifice according to the custom of the place.

Ibid. *Socrates* ought to suffer, because he esteems them to be no Gods whom the City takes for such, but he brings in other new Gods.

Ibid. A setter forth of strange Gods.

Pag. 166. According to ancient custom, that they who had eaten together should not die by the hands of one another, unless it were by some unlucky accident against their will.

Pag. 183. For men must first put off their Rusticity, and partake of the smaller Mysteries before the greater, and dance before they bear the Torch, and bear the Torch before they can act as High Priests.

Pag. 184. Ordained for men in things pertaining to God.

Pag. 189. Union. Communion.

Pag. 192. The same *Dioclesian* having been *Alytarches* in *Antioch*, and having put off his Emperor's Robes after he had performed the Olympicks, he refused the Style of Emperor, saying, I have laid

of the Greek.

laid aside earthly Majesty, and worn the Garb of the immortal *Jupiter*.

Pag. 193. ἀναλάνθους. Not to be named.

Ibid. As for the name of him that officiated as *Hierophanta* at that time, it is not lawful for me to mention it, since he it was that initiated this Author, and adoptred him into the *Eumolpide*.

Pag. 195. Μυρε. Mire.

Ibid. *Demon of Mater.*

Ibid. Winging of the Soul.

Pag. 199. *Philo.* For how could the Soul have any notion of God, unless he had inspired, and as much as possible united himself to it? For the mind of man durst not have presumed to have mounted up so high, as to meddle with God's Nature, if God himself had not drawn it to himself (as the mind of man can be known) and had stamped some impressions of truth upon its Faculties.

Pag. 206. For it is necessary, that he that sacrifices to the Father of the World, should use the mediation of the Son, perfect in all kinds of Virtue, both for the remission of Sins, and for the obtaining of all good things: and therefore it may be, it is, that he teaches the worshiper

The Interpretation

shiper of God before-hand, if not to fathom the power of the Creator, yet however always to endeavor to resemble this orderly frame of things, represented by the High Priest, who for that very reason is obliged to bear this pattern always in his mind: he ought in some respects to be transformed from a man into the nature of this orderly frame, and if I may speak the truth (which certainly becomes me) to be himself a little World.

Pag. 207. Essential man.

Pag. 208. For there as it should seem, two Temples of God, the one this-world, in which the first-begotten, the Divine Word is the High Priest: the other is the rational Soul, whose High Priest is the real man, who is sensibly represented by him that ordinarily performs the National Prayers and Sacrifices, who is described as cloathed with the aforesaid Garment in imitation of the whole Heaven, that both the World may co-operate with Man, and Man with the World.

Pag. 216. But there is a Communion of Souls, for those of the Gods communicate with those of Men, and those of Men with those of Brutes. Now the better

of the Greek.

better take care of the worse, the Gods of Men, and Men of Brutes, and the Supreme God of all. By this it appears that the world is subject to the Supreme God, Man to the World, Brutes to Man, and the Supreme God is both above and about all. And the Operations of this Supreme God are as it were his Beams, the Beams, as I may say, or influences of the World are the natures of things, and those of man are Arts and Sciences. Now these Influences operate by the World, and upon Man by the natural Beams of the World, and the natures of things by the Elements, and Men by Arts and Sciences. Now this Disposition of the whole Frame depends upon the nature of one, and is ordered by one mind. And it is this mind that is that Divine and Operative and Uniting Principle, that unites Men to the Gods, and the Gods to Men. All things are by these two, the World and Man, but all are under One.

Pag. 336. lin. 8. Ministring Spirits sent forth to minister. *Lin. 16.* Ministration of the Spirit.

Pag. 341. l. 16. The Laborious Angels stand before thy fiery Throne.

Pag. 344. l. penult. But not unto him,

The Interpretation of the Greek.

him, but to the Father of Jesus Christ the Bishop of all.

Pag. 345. l. 5. Not that any one who does so, deceives this Bishop who is Visible, but the Cheat is put on him who is Invisible. Now in this matter, the dealing is not with Flesh [and Blood] but with God who knows the Secrets.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

E R R A T A.

P. 61. l. 8. r. Personal. p. 8. marg. l. 3. r. Sect. 47. p. 9. marg. l. 5. r. Sect. 30. l. 14. r. Text with, p. 15. l. 11. r. Communion. p. 18. l. 21. post *use* add *of*. p. 36. l. 7. after *Israel* a Colon stop. p. 46. l. after *Altar* a Semicolon. p. 52. l. 11. r. *Altar*. Whatsoever. p. 54. lult. dele in the Part. p. 55. l. 24. after *Tabernacle*, add, after the Pattern shewed him in the Mount. p. 63. l. 27. r. *Idon*. p. 64. l. 7. r. *avri*. p. 77. the marginal quotations of *Justin* and *Irenaeus* at the bottom of the page transposed. p. ib. l. penult. r. *πρίστος*. p. 82. l. 9. r. *Hyrcanus*. p. 97. l. penult. r. designed. l. 9. r. *μὴ τὸ πῶς*. p. 101. marg. lult. r. init. p. 105. l. 4. r. *ἡλιοπολίτιν*. p. 108. marg. l. 8. r. *vir. Const.* p. 123. l. 7. r. *לְיָהוּיָאֵל*. p. 125. l. 23. r. again. p. 139. l. 5. r. or. Luk. r. *Shechinah*. p. 147. marg. lult. r. *Plur.* p. 148. marg. l. 3. r. *Elenfin*. 10. p. 149. l. 1. r. *χρίσας*. p. 155. r. ita. p. 158. marg. l. 18. r. *Ἀδελφόν*. Text. l. 23. r. *is*. p. 161. l. penult. r. received. p. 164. l. 17. r. *falsa*. p. 174. l. 25. r. *Zabii*. p. 180. l. 3. dele *distinct*. p. 184. l. 9. r. *μαρτυρία*. p. 189. l. 5. r. wordly. p. 192. l. 12. r. *Ἀποστόλους*. p. 196. l. 27. r. *Baubo*. p. 201. l. 22. r. *here*. p. 216. l. 19. r. *ἐνέργειαν*. p. 217. l. 3. r. *τέτων*. p. 219. l. 9. r. *τάχα δὲν*. p. 221. r. *ἐν τῷ*. p. 235. l. 17. r. *Diocesan*. p. 258. l. 28. r. *Consequence*. p. 267. l. 7. r. *hand*. p. 276. l. 16. and r. yet. p. 284. l. 27. a *Comma* at the end of the line. p. 346. l. 20. after *comparison* add with the *Visible Types*.

A Catalogue

*A Catalogue of some Books Printed
for, and sold by Benjamin Tooke
at the Ship in S. Paul's Church-
Yard.*

Folio.

H*erodoti Halicarnassai Historia grec.
Francisci Suarez de Legibus ac
Deo Legislatore.*

*M. T. Ciceronis opera omnia cum Anno-
tationibus Fani Gulielmi & Fani Gruteri.
Adjungitur item Frobenii Penna Tullianum
decem Inditibus juxta Exemplar Hambur-
genſe.*

*Skinneri Etymologicon Lingua Angli-
cana.*

Caussin's Holy Court.

*Walsh's History and Vindication of
the Irish Remonstrance.*

*A Collection of all the Statutes now
in force in Ireland.*

*Baker's Chronicle of the Kings of
England.*

Bishop

Bishop *Sanderfon's* Sermons, to which is added his Life.

Winche's Book of Entries, containing Declarations, Informations, and other select and approved Pleadings: with special Verdicts and Demurrers in most Actions real, personal and mix'd, with faithful References to the most authentick Printed Law Books. Together with a copious and useful Table.

Doctor *Littleton's* Sermons.

Heylin's Cosmography of the whole World.

The Parallel: or the new specious Association an old Rebellious Covenant.

A gentle Reflection on the modest Account, and a Vindication of the Loyal Abhorrrers from the Calumnies of a Factious Pen by the Author of the Parallel.

These Books following writ by Mr. Henry Dodwell.

Separation of Churches from Episcopal Government, as practised by the present Nonconformists proved Schismatical, from such Principles as are least controverted, and do withal most popularly explain the sinfulness and mischief

chief of Schism. In this Treatise the Sin against the Holy Ghost, the Sin unto death, and other difficult Scriptures are occasionally discoursed of. *Quarto.*

F. Stearne de Obſtinatione. Præfixa ſunt Prolegomena Apologetica de uſu dogmatum Philoſophicorum, præcipuè Stoicorum Theologia. Hen. Dodwell. Octavo.

Two Letters of Advice. 1. For Suſception of Holy Orders. 2. For Studies Theological, eſpecially ſuch as are rational. At the end of the former is inſerted a Catalogue of the Chriſtian Writers, and their Genuine Works of the firſt three Centuries. *Octavo.*

A Diſcourſe concerning *Sanchoniaton's Phœnician Hiſtory. Octavo.*

Some Conſiderations of preſent Concernment, how far the Romaniſts may be truſted by Princes of another Perſuaſion. *Octavo.*

Two ſhort Diſcourſes againſt the Romaniſts. *Twelves.*

A Reply to Mr. *Baxter's* pretended Confutation of a Book intitled Separation of the Churches from Episcopal Government, &c. To which are added three Letters written to him in 1673, concerning the poſſibility of Diſcipline under a Dioceſan Government. *Octavo.*

F I N I S.

